

A regular meeting of the Town of Victor Planning Board was held on February 12, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. at the Victor Town Hall at 85 East Main Street, Victor, New York, with the following members present:

PRESENT: Ernie Santoro, Chairman; Joe Logan, Vice Chairman , Al Gallina, Rich Seiter,

ABSENT: Heather Zollo

OTHERS: Wes Pettee, Town Engineer Consultant; Kim Kinsella, Project Coordinator; Al Benedict, Code Enforcement Officer; Dave Condon, Town Board Liaison; Councilman Ed Kahovec; Felix and Renee Christopher; David Nankin; James Cretekos; Karen Santoro; Andrew Torpey; Elaine Buchovecky; Jim Wudard; Robert Brostek; Sue Davies; Brianna Cole Allen; Dick Meyer; Kathy and Lane Boughton; Brian Emelson; John and Kristen Moore; Fred Rainaldi; Greg Meyer; Paul and Tracey Rowan; Gloria and David Schond; Cynthia Payne; Peter Battisti; Adam Ryczek; Rich Tiede; Joe Hurley; Scott Morrell; Owen and Deanne Hardy; Mark Fuentes; Edwin Rueda; Debby Trillaud, Secretary; Lisa Boughton, Secretary

Chairman Santoro read the announcements

### **BOARDS AND COMMITTEE UPDATES**

- Dave Condon nothing to comment

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

*Speakers are requested to limit comments to 3 minutes and will be asked to conclude comments at 5 minutes.*

### **WOODS AT VALENTOWN**

High Point Drive

Application #35-SP-18

Zoned – Planned Development District

Owner – Woods at Valentown, LLC

Acreage – 56.87

Applicant is requesting approval to construct 288 for rent apartments within 12 buildings on 56.87 acres. The project will consist of underground parking and the buildings will be 3 stories for a maximum height of 48 ft.

Mr. Cretekos addressed the Board

Mr. Cretekos from BME Enterprise - With me this evening is Fred Rinaldi, the applicant. We were obviously here last time to discuss the Woods at Valentown project and wanted to give you guys a quick update of what has occurred since the last meeting. One of the main things

we did do was to meet with the Fire Department including Bob Graham, Sean McAdoo, and the Fishers Fire Chief. We basically reviewed their last round of comments and all the comments and the agreements we made last March when we meet with them during the rezoning process. So we worked thru those items and given a couple more things that they had requested. They issued another response letter to the board, dated January 29, which kind of summarizes their current stance. So at this point we believe we have worked thru all the fire safety issues with them so we are working on revising the plans based on a couple of their comments. At the last meeting the board requested us to complete a balloon study. The weather was nice enough yesterday where we actually got that done. So we had good visibility and the wind was less than 5 mph so it helped us keep the alignment correct. Basically, what we did was flew balloons at the center of each building at the maximum roof height. The packet I provided in front of you shows the views, primarily from Valentown Road where the greatest visibility is. We didn't actually see the balloons looking from Thayer/Baker Road, we did have binoculars so we were scouring thru the trees for them and the other view showed as you can see, is down from Turk Hill Road at the bottom of that other apartment complex. You have to look at the zoomed in picture to see actually where the balloon is, but thru the trees you can pick it out, I believe that's photo location number 6. One of the other comments from one of the neighbors, the farm to the east of our property, during the public comment period last time did bring up some stream health concerns. I would like to remind you that back in 2005, when we were going thru the FEIS and DEIS, as part of the wetland mitigation we rebuilt wetlands right in this area here. We were required to do a stream water quality monitoring report. That report started the end of 2005-2006 for a year of monitoring to collect baseline data and then sequentially after that they monitored on a quarterly bases the stream health. There were 6 sampling locations, 3 were in our site that were upstream of the neighboring property and there were 3 that were downstream of that. The monitoring occurred during the initial phases of constructing when we were doing some of the grading in the lower parts of what is now section one, construction of storm water management facility B and then some of the High Point areas that doesn't really drain over to there. But the reports indicated there was no impacts from the construction activities. We reviewed this with our client and at the board's request we would be willing to re-kick off that monitoring thru construction for this, just to confirm that we are not impacting the stream.

Mr. Rainaldi - Rainaldi Brothers Woods at Valentown

Mr. Rainaldi—I have authorized using the baseline capture from the original DEIS FEIS and using that as the baseline to not only measure during construction but in perpetuity. So I authorized that to be measured at a standardized sequence in perpetuity. So I am happy to do that, we fully intend to be a good neighbor with the Rose farm.

Chairman Santoro—Thank you Fred.

Mr. Cretkos- In the report, we did monitor several parameters; nitrogen chloride, phosphorus, suspended solids, macro invert obits, so it's kind of a full complete measure of stream health, they look at the different microorganisms there and kind of establish what is considered a healthy stream. The other neighbor that spoke at the last public comment period was a

neighbor over by Section 4. So we have kind of rebooted a cross section exhibit that we had during the re-zoning process to just kind of add a little bit more detail for you. This was also provided to the town earlier today, this basically shows the relationship looking at a cross section view looking right along this alignment here. It's one to one ratio so there is no vertical or horizontal exaggeration and this does represent what we found when we did our balloon study with the relation with the height of the trees, which is that they are all greater than what our buildings are going to be at his point. I also like to note again for our buffer setbacks, if this was an industrial zoned property we would be required to provide a 100 foot residential buffer to the adjoining residential properties, right now this wooded area is about 135 feet deep and it's all existing wooded fully matured trees so that will all be preserved with the projects. We believe that is more than sufficient to satisfy any buffering requirements to that property. Also the other comment that the board had at the last time was in regards to some of the balcony lightings and how those views were going to appear on the buildings and the different light throws. Most of these, all the lightings in the balconies are recessed can fixtures so they only really project light into its own balcony space, there is not light throw on the ground from those. So as you're looking at the buildings you will see some point source on the balconies if there illuminated but you won't see any impacts on the ground or to neighboring properties.

Mr. Rainaldi—Just as a point of clarification the town has the right to add emergency lighting at their discretion, so that would be the only change that would be made, in addition to the decorative lighting, the town can put emergency lighting anywhere. We will commit to paint that lighting, the light box, it will all be naturally compliant. We will paint it the same color as the building so it matches. These 2 presentation pieces we have used both for the buffer and the lighting, I will be sure to have full scale copies submitted to Mr. Rueda and his attorney.

Mr. Cretekos—So regarding the lighting we will be providing an update a point plot for the property. It will include the small light fixtures on the ground level some of these decorative lightings on the exterior, they are dark sky compliant still they are just going to have a little bit of light throw around the base and entrance of the facility. There will also be a light over here on the side by the garage entrances, but again it's just for ingress and egress. Besides that if you have any other questions, we would be happy to field them or if there is other public comments.

Chairman Santoro—Open up to the public if anyone has any comment or questions, step up, state your name and address.

Mr. Miguel Reyes—I represent Mr. Rueda, who is the neighbor immediately adjacent to the project. Mr. Rueda was looking at some of the maps that Mr. Rainaldi submitted to the Town and there are huge maps containing many pages. On some of these maps he noticed there is a retaining wall in one of the parking lots mainly this would be on page 6 of the maps. And he thought that was a good idea because that is a retaining wall running alongside a parking lot. He thought perhaps that would provide some measure of protection from cars that are driving in so that the lights don't shine onto his house. He also noted that there is a parking lot in front of the building that is designated as Building 12. That does not contain a

similar retaining wall providing a buffer against the lighting. On several of the maps, in particular page 15 of those maps, there is drawn a tree line and as Mr. Rainaldi has said, many of the trees in the buffer area will remain there and are fully grown trees but they are deciduous trees so in the winter time they don't provide any visual buffer. So we would like to see the developer incorporate some Evergreens, especially along the tree line that is depicted on page 15 of the maps. And lastly, Mr. Rueda had noticed on page 18 there is a feature, northeast of his property, which is designated as a bio retention area. We didn't know what that was and would like some explanation to that, as to what it is.

Chairman Santoro—Can you tell him what that is?

Mr. Cretekos—Just to clarify a couple of small items. The parking area I believe you are referring to is this parking area between the buildings. This is a recessed area there is a retaining wall here that is going to be about a 8-10 feet tall so there will not be any lights, headlights, coming thru that. We also have a row of trees, Evergreens right here that will prevent any of the headlights as they are turning in to this from reaching that area.

The bio retention area, which you are referring to is located right in this area, is just a storm water practice, so it'll just basically be like a rain garden, it just receives runoffs from the adjacent impervious areas, filters it, treats it and discharges it to the storm sewer. So it's just an additional plantings and landscaping.

Mr. Reyes—One of his questions was why the parking lot that is in front of Building 12 doesn't have a retention wall.

Mr. Cretekos –The retaining wall that we provided here is necessary based on the grades because the garage enters at a lower level, this area here is just at grade so runoff right here actually sheet flows off the edge of pavement into bio retention area for treatment. So we can't do a hard barrier there for screening.

Chairman Santoro—Anyone else? Anyone from the board?

Mr. Logan—Just a comment about Building 12, the question from Mr. Rueda's attorney was there is no wall there. It looks to me that any of the cars that would park there, the headlights would be very much off alignment from shining directly at his home so I just wanted to make that observation. Otherwise, I like the layout you have put here Fred, with the 3 building set well back from Mr. Rueda's property. It goes a long way to satisfying those issues.

Mr. Rainaldi—It should also be said that we have great surface area to react to anything, it's not a type of thing if we don't catch it here it can't be fixed, so I'm committing to protecting the integrity of his home and enjoyment of his home. One thing I failed to mention that was a comment from the County Planning was with regards to the trail systems and the first meeting with Victor Trails, and I believe they are bringing in Grock as well to confirm the layout and easements that they would like for the public use and enjoyment is this Sunday at 2 or 2:30. So we will move quickly to chronicle that just as I had promised at the County Planning Board meeting.

Chairman Santoro—Okay, we have a resolution, it's not an approval resolution. We are not at that stage yet. This is a resolution that this board be the lead agency

### RESOLUTION

On motion made by Joe Logan, seconded by Al Gallina

WHEREAS, on December 5, 2018, the Secretary of the Planning Board received a site plan application entitled Woods @ Valentown located on High Point Drive

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the applicant to develop 288 residential apartment units within 12 buildings on approximately 56.87 acres as part of the High Point Business Park Planned District; and,

WHEREAS, the application is a Type I Action under State Environmental Quality Review Act; and,

WHEREAS, the Town of Victor Planning Board intends to proceed with a coordinated review and a lead agency must be established prior to determination of significance; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Town of Victor Planning Board declares its intent to act as lead agency and directs the Planning Board Secretary to mail the EAF, with Part 1 completed by the project sponsor, and a copy of the site plan application to all identified involved and interested agencies, notifying them that a lead agency must be agreed upon within 30 calendar days of the date that the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) was mailed to them expressing the Town Planning Board's intent to act as lead agency. Notification will be sent to the NYS DEC and Monroe County Water Authority. The Ontario County Planning Department, Town Highway, and Town of Farmington Water & Sewer Department will also be notified of the pending application as interested agencies.

WHEREAS, the involved agencies either submitted responses indicating that they concurred with the Town Planning Board serving as Lead Agency, or 30 calendar days has passed since Involved Agencies were notified of the Victor Town Planning Board's intent to serve as SEQR Lead Agency;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT, RESOLVED, the Town of Victor Planning Board hereby affirms its SEQR Lead Agency status

Ernie Santoro	Aye
Joe Logan	Aye

Al Gallina	Aye
Rich Seiter	Aye
Heather Zollo	Absent

Approved 4 Ayes, 0 Nay

### **PIPER MEADOWS SUBDIVISION**

860 High Street & 870 High St

Application # 1-PS-19

Zoned Residential 1 w/C overlay

Owner – 860 Andrew Glasgow (20.40 acres) & 870 Glenn Piper (20.6 acres)

Applicant is requesting approval for a 41 lot subdivision on 41.09 acres. The project is comprised of 2 adjacent parcels approximately 20 acres each and will consist of 2 existing single family homes and 39 additional lots. Section 1 will consist of 21 single family homes and Section 2 will consist of 20 townhouse lots (ten 2-unit bldgs). This will be the second step in a 3 step process for a major subdivision. The Sketch Plan was acknowledged complete October 23, 2018.

Chairman Santoro—Our next item is Piper Meadows Subdivision. Anyone here for that?

Mr. Rich Tiede—From Marathon Engineering and I have Scott Morrell the applicant with us. So just a quick recap this is a 41 acre site, zoned R1 residential with a C overlay district, which puts it 1 unit per acre density. So we are proposing 41 total units and 20 townhome units and 21 single family two which are the existing house out there. We saw you a couple times for sketch plan, we are here for preliminary overall tonight. So from sketch plan, the major changes that happen was on the single family lots on the cul-de-sac. We pulled that cul-de-sac back about 2—25 feet to set the houses a little more on the flat spot and to pull the clearing limits back into the lots a little bit more. On the townhome side was where we saw a little more of the changes as we engineered this. So one of the first ones was a storm water management pond, was out behind the units down the hill a little bit more. We have pulled that up into a centralize location with the storm water pond for the single family so that it kind of creates one cohesive area on each side of the wetland stream or the storm water management. In the process of doing this we have the roadway for the townhomes a little closer into the site, this has opened up and allowed us to save a little more of the wooded area on the south and easterly sides where the existing residents are at. One of the other big changes that you will see on this plan is our sanitary sewer route, which kind of is highlighted in green with clearing where we are coming out the backside where the townhomes are, wrapping around the knoll and taking it down to Route 96. So I think our main purpose tonight is to get your feedback, the public feedback so that we can take these comments and incorporate them with the other comments we have received from all the agencies and get a revised package back to you that meets your requirements. So with that I'd like to open it up to the Board for any questions you have or comments.

Chairman Santoro—First off we will open it up for the Public. Anyone from the public have question or comment?

Mrs. Davies—930 High Street. The school district is located at the top of the hill. It's a huge clay hill, as a matter of fact, its 85% clay. Clay does not absorb water, especially on a slope and that slope where the Piper Meadows Project is being proposed goes right towards, of course, Route 96. The school is 130 acres that is located covered with building, parking lots, sidewalks, artificial turf, and in all about 50 – 60 % of 130 acres is covered with something. 50-60% less area where the water can be absorbed. The water that wasn't factored in when Morrel's crew did assessment on the water amount and the flow direction. How do we know this? The engineer involved in the configuration was standing in the middle of High Street and he told us. So he was standing there but looking down towards 96 and doing his configuration that way. Never factoring in the water that comes off the knoll from the school. If you were to divide this 130 acres into quarters, by north, south, east and west, approximately 42 plus acres of water drainage was not factored in. High Street is on the west side of the school property, the water from the schools property runs unabated over High Street from Dr. Pipers southern property line to the Marshall Lane, there is no drainage ditch, if you'll notice to collect the water and change the direction, so as it comes down from the school it comes over the road on occasion when we have high water event, and there is no drain on that side of the street. Water runs down the slope on the top of the clay thru the 40 acres of the proposed building site. 40 acres of cleared clay land, towards Route 96. Water on clay has a mind of its own, it will change direction on path downward wherever it wants to go, and I know this because I have a drainage tile from the school, which drains the water every which way on my side yard. All this water empties into Mud Creek and eventually into Irondequoit Bay and into Lake Ontario. There is a new law according to the Soil and Water Conservation Dept. at Cornell Extension in Canandaigua, which requires storm water from new construction to be treated on site before released into creeks, swales and lakes. So all this water from their lawns has to be treated on site with a treatment center and then it can be drained into the swales or creek beds. The proposed sewer plans will drain into the existing sewer line running under 96 and according to the authorities that I talked to that sewer line is already at its capacity. Two or three years ago when Victor had a water event of several inches of rain, this very spot that we are talking about that drains into the sewer line that goes onto Route 96 had a manhole cover erupt due to the excess water that is naturally mixed with raw sewage spilling on and over Route 96, near Lane Road. If you remember what I said before, the water from the top of the hill, where the school is to 96, drains into Mud Creek and into Lake Ontario. This 40 home development on this slope with these characteristics is going to require an extensive sophisticated drainage system to prevent another environmental disaster, bigger than before. Thank you.

Chairman Santoro—Mike, are you up on the issue of the sewers being upgraded?

Mike Simon from LaBella - We are still evaluating the plans relative to the storm waters, as well as the infrastructure, we are working with the Town of Farmington on the capacity of the existing sewer. They have provided a preliminary engineers report, which we are reviewing and will work with the Town and the Town of Farmington relative to capacities of the sanitary sewers, the storm as well as water infrastructure. We don't have any definitive answers right now at this point, but I took copious notes from the statements given and we will look into them. Thank you.

Chairman Santoro—Anyone else like to speak or ask a question?

Mr. Schond – at 846 High Street. I own the adjacent property to the north side of the development here. I appreciate moving the houses a little further from my lot line but after the earlier presentation I'm still kind of wondering, all those houses are right on that area north of the road. It would appear to drain naturally into my lot in the eastern portion of it. All those other properties, all those creeks and the retaining ponds and everything are going to eventually drain into the lower portion of my property into a creek that's already there, a spring fed creek. I have serious concerns about that and whether the storm sewer control system from the northern portion of those properties can actually be drained into those retention ponds at all except for the road surfaces which it seems to have a pretty good sewer control. But like Ms. Davies said that the clay soil is going to make that a pretty impermeable area and with all the rooflines and parking lots. Of course there is still the problem with the added traffic into an already high traffic area. A lot more foot traffic, just a whole series of conditions their plans call for using my hedgerow as the demarcation and I noticed that the Woods @ Valentown they actually put up some nice trees and structuring there to buffer the adjacent properties, not sure why we wouldn't be afforded that kind of consideration also. Where some sort of demarcation we talked fences, berms that kind of thing to separate those property lines, possibly to even control the flow of the water into that area, so that it pretty much has it for me.

Chairman Santoro—Thank you. Anyone else wish to speak or ask a question?

Mrs. Kelly Goforth—I live at 7177 Lane, so I live next to Dave. I would just like to echo similar to the comments that were shared previously in the meetings around the traffic. So the people that live on Lane, we honestly can't get out of our driveways already, as it is in the mornings, its hard backing out. I run pretty much every morning on these roads and it is already a little dicey at times, it's not very pedestrian friendly. So I think another thing to think about, and I know we had made shared recommendations from the information we had gotten from our neighbors and the feedback we had gotten from our neighbors, if this is family friendly and if there are kids that are going to be living here there needs to be much more done on Lane Road from the pedestrian standpoint. It is not safe. The people do not plow the sidewalk, so you have to go on the road, people are driving much too fast, the speed limit is too fast at school time especially. So I just think that is something to really think about. I know there is a whole transportation study going on but from what I read this area is not a priority in that transportation study, which is a little bit disturbing from that standpoint this area still needs attention as well. So that's a lot more cars to be added to that area. Those are my statements, I don't know if there is any information.

Chairman Santoro—it's a little early on here, there will be traffic studies. Anyone else wish to speak?

Mr. Owen Hardy—I live at 7217 Lane which is about half way down from High Street towards 96 on the south side of the road. My concern is, you know I'm somewhat handicapped, the traffic on Lane Road is horrendous. In the morning it is a 40 mph speed limit which I can't understand, our mailbox is on the other side of the road, so myself or my wife have to cross Lane Road. Now from my house you are looking at a little hill and believe me when they come over that hill you better move, and I can't move to fast. My concern is we should have a 25 mph



speed limit, we are adding lots of cars, I do not know where they are going to go. Even now in the mornings there is a line of traffic trying to get onto 96 either right or left, it's dangerous to say the very least. Lane Road is not a safe road to walk on, I certainly can't. Or even on the shoulder, the water is also a concern. The house I have had water issues before we bought it and they had put drainage tiles in towards Dave's property. Before I bought the house they put a gully in down my driveway because of the runoff. Those are the big concerns because of traffic. Where are we going to put these cars? All these people, if we put 40 units in there, there is going to be easily 80 cars that we are adding to an already heavy traffic. We have an issue getting out of own driveway, so those are my big concerns, we are just adding more problems to the corridor between Lane Road, Route 96 and High Street, I don't know where you're going to put them. So that's my comment.

Chairman Santoro—Anyone else wish to speak or asks questions?

Mrs. Elain Buchovecky—I live at 26 Woodward Street in Jacobs Landing and my opposition to this is completely different. I am the recipient of one of these developments up above me, sitting on a hill much like this one is going to be also. I have something to read, I apologize I'm not a public speaker, so I'll do the best I can. This land is currently zoned R1 residential and has been zoned R1 residential for decades. The Town code paragraph 211-19A, in the district regulations specifically states its permitted use should be for single family dwellings. Single family detached, residential dwellings. One single family detached living unit is permitted per lot. The proposed plan includes 10 townhomes with 2 units per lot, which is not permitted in a R1 residential zoning district. I understand the zoning will be changed hopefully, for the developer. Townhomes being proposed are higher density then single family homes constructed on one-half to one acre lots. Approving a development with townhomes and changing the zoning from R1 zoning is essentially a vote to enrich the developer to the expense of the community and the current residents in Victor. Higher density development has increased risk of storm water management issues and that is what I have been a recipient of with the last development. The applicant has a poor track record of implementing storm water management plans, best practices and performing the required maintenance at the current Silverton Glenn development in Victor. During the past 5 years there has been extensive storm water management issues and flooding as a result if the Silverton Glen development, which includes high density townhomes. Over the past 5 years the development has received hundreds, hundreds of storm water inspection reports that identified deficiencies. During the same time the Town has not enforced the code regarding storm management. As a result residence downstream of Silverton Glenn have experienced storm water management issues and flooding, including myself.

In April 2014 the NYS DEC found problems with Silverton Glenn storm water management system and issued a notice of violation to Mr. Morrell. In July 2014, the NYS DEC issued another notice of violation to Morrell. In 2015 the NYS DEC issued a letter to Morrell, identifying many deficiencies and required that they prepare a plan... submit a plan to correct the deficiencies. In 2017 the Silverton Glenn ponds overflowed resulting in significant flooding of downstream properties and damage in the Jacobs Landing subdivision, as well as the restaurant. The home in the subdivision that was damaged the most was mine. As a result of this the developers performed some maintenance and design changes in the Silverton Glenn water system. In 2018 the NYS DEC conducted another site inspection of Silverton Glenn and found significant deficiencies yet again. As a result of the 2018 inspection, the DEC is now requiring

Mr. Morrell to redesign portions of storm water management system to bring them into compliance for the DEC regulations. To register the dam that was created, yes a dam, at the top of the hill over my house, to hold back nearly a million gallons of storm water as a class B intermediate hazard dam. It has to be registered with the state now. Prepare an emergency action plan for that dam that was created in Silverton Glenn. The NYS DEC has indicated that, that dam failure would result in downstream flooding and damage at least 10 or more properties, right where I live. The whole problem in Silverton Glenn started because the Town Planning Board approved a development with high density townhomes. If the Silverton development was comprised of all single family homes there would be fewer units, less impervious surfaces, and the risk of downstream flooding would be lower. As a result of approving high density townhomes the residence living downstream of Silverton Glenn and Jacobs Landing now live with an increased risk of flooding, since they live downstream from a Class B intermediate hazard dam created in Silverton Glenn. This is the only dam in Victor that is classified by the NYS DEC as a Class B intermediate hazard, and we have the Victor Town Planning Board to thank for allowing it. Can you imagine, the town approved the Silverton Glenn development to enrich the developer at the expense of the community and the residence of Victor. The Town Planning Board now has a proposal by the same developer to build another subdivision with townhomes in Victor on a hill. I would encourage the Town Board to carefully review the applicant track record of building subdivisions with townhomes including the issues and violation notices received from the NYS DEC for the Silverton Glenn development. The Planning Board should also carefully consider how this development will negatively impact the community and current residents of Victor. Thank you.

Chairman Santoro—Anyone else wish to speak or ask a question?

Mr. Dave Nankin—Good Evening, I live at 1174 Chaucer Court. I was just wondering addressing the traffic problem. Would it not be better for the community instead of single family homes to have patio homes? The single family homes will have probably at least one child with them. The three bedrooms or more and that will add to the traffic at the height of the rush hour. A patio home, townhome, will probably not have children, it might but much less likely and retired person like myself are able to better negotiate the high traffic times and not add to the congestion. I just thought that would be a better mix and I know that Mr. Morrell has no problem selling patio homes cause everybody is getting as old as I am and everybody wants to downscale. I don't think he can build them fast enough to be honest with you. I just thought I would put that out there. Thank you.

Chairman Santoro—Anyone else? Anyone on the board have anything?

Mr. Seiter—I'd like to address the traffic comments. I live in the vicinity and I need to agree that Lane Road/High Street intersection on any given school morning looks like Broadway and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. I mean it is a line of cars. I have seen Lane Road all times of the day, weekend, and the notion that this development would not add to or impact the traffic negatively in this immediate vicinity is just ridiculous. Like the gentleman said, your adding 80 cars, maybe it is only 40 or 60, where are they going to go. The notion that this is not a traffic impact does not hold any water.

The second comment about the zoning. I am not a big fan of changing the zoning to fit the applications. The zoning laws are in effect when you buy the property, that's the rules. So then coming before the board, any applicant who is asking for a variance or a zone change to make your plan work, not a fan of that either. Third comment, not knowing any of the details about the DEC issue this woman raised, it certainly needs a little more discussion if there is indeed a poor track record of the water management and failure to respond to concerns and issues. I think it needs more discussion.

Chairman Santoro—Joe.

Mr. Logan—I was very interested to hear the comments about Silverton Glenn as they might relate to this project. So I would be interested to see how much our engineers have to say about that and as we move forward with it. There is a lot still to talk about on this, traffic included. Like you said, this is early in the process so we have a lot more to discuss.

Mr. Gallina—I think storm water management and traffic as well as the sewer infrastructure are going to be three key components to the SEQR that we have to look very closely at.

Chairman Santoro—Mike, does LaBella have anything at this time?

Mr. Simons—LaBella—Not at the preliminary phase Mr. Chairman, we will of course take all these comments under consideration as we move forward with the final application submittals from the applicants engineer and take a very hard look at these concerns by the residents. Thank you

Mr. Logan—Ernie, I did have one other comment, Sorry. I noticed Brian Emelson responded to pedestrian connectivity within this development and to the local sidewalk network. I am recommending that the northerly house entrance be connected up to Lane Road with a piece of sidewalk and then have a pedestrian crossing at the Lane Road intersection. Also, recommend putting a trail between both cul-de-sacs, sort of an internal connectivity. If we went that far with both subdivisions no matter which way they end up in layout, whether its townhomes or single family homes, my personal opinion is that I think a sidewalk connecting the two driveway entrances and then on up to Lane Road would be more affective for the people in the more southerly development. That's food for thought. I think that would help make it safer along Lane Road. The bigger question that someone brought up was who is plowing them was a good point. Appreciate bringing that forward. In any case most of the time when there is no snow it would be much safer, I think, to walk along High Street to connect without a sidewalk on that side and forcing them to cross to where there are sidewalks on the east side of High Street on the southerly division. I would like that to be considered as you're going forward.

Mr. Tiede—A couple of comments I want to make in regards to what you had just talked about with the sidewalks. You need a little more topo to assess making the connection up to Lane Road. I don't know that looking at photographs, that we have a culvert that we are going to have cross that is going to be an issue and several utility poles that are kind of right smack dab in the spot where I think a sidewalk is probably going to go that we are going to have to deal with but we are going to look at that. Conductivity inside the subdivision trail networks are being

considered and definitely trail networks connecting the two separate components are there. A sidewalk along High Street I think, is going to be a difficult proposition because where the wetlands come up next to the roadway, there is a guardrail and there is quite a drop from the shoulder down to where the wetlands are. We are looking at making that a little more convenient, possibly a connection inside the subdivision. So there is a couple alternatives that we might be able to consider. We will work with town staff on that to come up with the best solution with the pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Logan—We will work thru that as we move forward. Thank you

Mr. Tiede—I'd also like to make a comment, if I could, about the northerly property line. It doesn't show on this rendering but the grading plans we have graded a swale in the back of those lots all along that northerly edge that is going to take that drainage. It's also going to provide a barrier between the yards and the woods line there. It creates a separation between the two properties. I wanted to add that piece to the record.

Chairman Santoro— As we move along the public hearing is still open for the next time the applicant is here, so if anyone has any comments at that time they can do that. Next item is the Torpey Subdivision.

### **FINAL SUBDIVISION:**

#### **TORPEY SUBDIVISION - FINAL**

7980 CR 41

Appl No 1-FS-19

SBL # 26.00-1-47.200

Owner – Log & Timber Structures, LLC

Zoned – Residential

Acres – 19.13

Applicant is requesting approval to subdivide 19.13 acres into 5 single family building lots. The applicant has a single family home under construction at this site on lot 1 and is now requesting to subdivide 4 additional single family lots for a total of 5 sites. This will be the final step in a 3 step process for a major subdivision. The Sketch Plan was acknowledged complete July 10, 2018 and the Preliminary Subdivision was approved on November 27, 2018.

Mr. Andrew Torpey – Good Evening. My name is Andrew Torpey from Log and Timber Structure, LLC. I am here to request final approval on the proposed subdivision of 19.3 acres and 5 lots on County Rd 41.

Chairman Santoro – I believe we closed the public hearing last time or the time before. It has been closed. We do have a resolution for you tonight.

### **RESOLUTION**

On motion made by Al Gallina, seconded by Joe Logan

WHEREAS the Planning Board made the following findings of fact:

1. An application was received on January 8, 2019 by the Secretary of the Planning Board for a Final Subdivision entitled Torpey Subdivision.
2. It is the intent of the applicant to subdivide 19.133 acres into 5 lots.
3. The application was deemed to be an Unlisted Action pursuant to Section 8 of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act Regulations and a Short Environmental Assessment Form was prepared
4. The Planning Board, as lead agency, found that there would be no significant impacts to the environment as a result of the action and a negative declaration be prepared November 27, 2018.
5. The Conservation Board reviewed the final subdivision on February 5, 2019 and made comments.
6. Pursuant to Section 27-8J of the Town Code, a recreation fee for each lot, or in the event of a multiple dwelling, a recreation fee for each family unit, in lieu of park land shall be paid to the Town before issuance of a building permit.
7. Pursuant to 2.9.18 of the Design & Construction Standards, individual homeowner lamp posts shall be installed in lieu of a lighting district.
8. The Planning Board has considered the need for sidewalks with the proposed major subdivision, Pursuant to Section 184-16.C(6) of the Victor Town Code, and has determined that the sidewalks will not be required due to the location of the development being a significant distance from any existing sidewalk network, and there would be little community benefit to sidewalk infrastructure in this portion of the Town.
9. Pursuant to 2.7.9.2 of the Design & Construction Standards the use of gutter downspouts to splash blocks shall be allowed in lieu of dry wells.
10. On January 24, 2019, the Coordinated Fire Service indicated that all homes shall be residentially sprinklered in lieu of a hydrant being installed.
11. Section 5.2.11 of the Town's Design and Construction Standards (Access Management Guidelines) indicates "Residential access (i.e. driveway, private road or drive, and public road) supporting more than 3 single family units, up to 10 units, may be handled on a case by case basis at the discretion of the Planning Board."
12. Section 5.3.0 of the Town's Design and Construction Standards defines Private Drive

(Common Drive) as: A Driveway, as defined in Section 211-12 of the Victor Town Code used as ingress and egress to not more than three properties. In addition, Section 2.9.1.5 (Driveway) of the Design and Construction Standards indicates: Four (4) or more lots must be served by a drive, road, or street, consistent with these Design and Construction Standards for dedicated roads and streets.

13. During the course of Planning Board review, it was found that a consolidated, single access point onto County Road 41 would be the safest configuration for ingress and egress to the five (5) lots due to topography of the land and existing roadway geometry. The segment of the shared private driveway providing access to County Road 41 will be 24-feet in width to allow for ingress and egress at the same time.

14. Section 211-48 of the Victor Town Code states: All development shall be consistent with the current Town Design and Construction Standards unless specifically waived by the Planning Board.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town of Victor Planning Board hereby waives the provisions of the Design and Construction Standards that would otherwise require no more than three lots or properties to be served by one common driveway (Sections 2.9.1.5, and 5.3.0 (Definitions, Private Drive / Common Drive)), and hereby allows the five (5) proposed lots of the Torpey Subdivision be served by one private common driveway for access onto County Road 41; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Final Subdivision application of Andrew Torpey, Log & Timber Structures, 2776 Pond Road, Lima, New York, Major Subdivision entitled Torpey Subdivision, drawn by Thornton Engineering, LLP, Sheets 1 through 3, Project 18-664, dated October 2018, last revised January 8, 2019, received by the Planning Board Secretary October 10, 2018, Planning Board Application No. 1-FS-19 BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

**Conditions that must be met prior to the Chairman signing the preliminary subdivision plan:**

1. That no final signatures will be given on the plans until all legal and engineering fees have been paid as per Fee Reimbursement Local Law adopted November 25, 1996.
2. That Section 4 Standard Approval Conditions for all Subdivisions (Major & Minor) of the Design and Constructions be met.
3. That the comments in a letter dated from LaBella Associates be addressed.
4. That the comments in a letter dated from Code Enforcement Officer be addressed.

**Conditions that are on-going standard conditions that must be adhered to:**

1. That the major subdivision comply with Town of Victor Design and Construction Standard Land Development, including Section 4.
2. That all conservation easements show the placement of markers on final plans.
3. Should an underground stream be encountered during construction, the Developer is to address the encroachment and impact to the underground stream to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.
4. That the detention facilities be built prior to any stripping of topsoil.
5. That the applicant strip of topsoil and grading on a lot by lot basis.
6. That the applicant shall install code compliant sprinkler systems in residential homes on Lots 2 thru 5.
7. That an address board be installed at the entrance to every driveway with 4" reflective numbers indicating the address. The address boards shall be located at a similar height and location on every driveway in a manner that grass and/or weeds shall not be likely to obscure the sign.

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board Secretary distribute the Planning Board's approval letter.

Ernie Santoro	Aye
Joe Logan	Aye
Heather Zollo	Absent
Al Gallina	Aye
Rich Seiter	Nay

Approved 3 Ayes, 1 Nays

Chairman Santoro - You can now go apply for your building permits. Would you like the Resolution? Next is a couple of informal discussions. The first one is 7850 Royal Woods subdivision.

### **INFORMAL DISCUSSION**

#### **7980 ROYAL WOODS SUBDIVISION**

Zoned – Limited Development District – A Density Overlay

Owners – Feliz & Rane Christopher

Applicant is requesting to subdivide the property into two lots and build a house. The property is in the Limited Development District.

Mrs. Ranee and Feliz Christopher—We live at 7850 Royal Woods. The land is about 17 acres, we wish to divide into 3.5 acre lot to build a small home coming off of Benson Road. Home and office.

Chairman Santoro – Al, is this one of yours?

Mr. Benedict – Just to give you a heads up to why they are here. They are the owners of Lot 6 which is 17 acres in Royal Woods. They would like to subdivide that lot and build a new home on that piece. Just to give you some history as to why they are here. Royal View was built back in 1994, or approved back then, it's approximately 42 acres, 19 lots plus an accepted parcel. So if you do the math the density back then was roughly 2. It was different zoning, it was R1, and it is now part of the LDD District and also now carries a density of 3 acres per dwelling in it. For them to subdivide off a piece, you would now have 20 lots in 42 acres, therefore making the density even greater than what it is now, therefore, right now the subdivision is what people would call pre-existing nonconforming, however now we are doing something that would make it further nonconforming. So they would need variances in order to do that to the yield number. So I suggested they come here before you informally with just a cost of their time and find out if this board is interested in pursuing and allowing them to do that before they go to the zoning board.

Chairman Santoro – Anyone have a comment or question?

Mr. Logan – I'm trying to discern from the plan and maybe Al you can show me on here where this home is on an aerial, it's kind of an odd shaped piece.

Mrs. Christopher – The triangle piece that comes off of Benson.

Mr. Logan – Your property is along Benson but it also goes to Royal Woods, correct? At the end of the drive in Royal Woods at the one home that's next to that there is like hammerhead. I assume that's a snowplow turnaround, it was never designed as a house access for another lot. Is that where you want to put your house or do you come right off of Benson Road?

Mrs. Christopher—Benson, yes. Kind of far away from our home.

Mr. Benedict – It would be right down here in this area (points at map)

Mr. Logan – At the lower right corner of the aerial that I'm looking at.

Mr. Benedict – Their present house is up here (points to map)

Mr. Logan – So you live in that house now and want to move further away onto Benson Road. Ok. That is the only question I have at the moment.



Mr. Gallina – Maybe Al you can rerun the math, the total parent parcel was how many acres?

Mrs. Christopher –17

Mr. Gallina -- That's your particular parcel but the total original parcel.

Mr. Benedict – The total subdivision is 42 acres and just shy of that.

Mr. Gallina – So this would be the 20<sup>th</sup> house.

Mr. Logan – On 42 acres? It would be a 2 acres per home density. Right now it is zoned for 3 acres per home, with a Limited Development District.

Mr. Benedict – Correct. At the time I'm not sure what exactly it was but I noticed it was an R1 residential.

Mr. Logan – We did not have the density overlay at that time?

Mr. Benedict – No we did not.

Mr. Gallina – Are there any conservation easements on the 17 acre parcel?

Mr. Benedict – Yes. Conservation easement goes up here across the driveway back down around also back into neighboring properties as well.

Mr. Logan – So they will be able to maintain what's there and build on their white area.

Mr. Benedict – They would be building on an area where there is no conservation easement.

Mr. Logan – Any setback issues in that area?

Mr. Gallina – You're doing fine, that's kind of where I was poking at.

Mr. Benedict – We haven't been presented with a plan. I think I did some measurements and they may have room.

Mr. Gallina – Any topographical challenges in that parcel?

Mr. Benedict – I believe there are a lot of slopes in this area, mostly where it is conservation easement. I believe it flattens out in here. I think this parcel was absorbed into the overall, prior to the subdivision being ----. I believe there was something down here where there is evidence of a driveway that came in in this area. So there may have been a house down here at one time.

Mr. Gallina – Thank you.

Mr. Logan – I'm just looking at it on Google Earth to see if I can get a better sense of what they

are challenged with. I'm just trying to see. It looks pretty heavily wooded along there. It looks like it drops away from the road a little bit, but rolling.

Mrs. Christopher – The flat land is quite big.

Mr. Logan – Do you get a sense of how dry it is year round?

Mrs. Ranee Christopher – I've never seen water.

Mr. Logan – Al, have you noticed whether there is any potential for wetlands? There is a pond.

Mrs. Christopher – That is not on our property.

Mr. Logan – It's just at the bottom of your aerial there in blue. What do you need from us tonight, I guess is my question?

Mrs. Christopher – Whether we can formally apply?

Mr. Logan – You can apply for a variance.

Mr. Benedict – The next step would be to apply for a variance but figured if you guys weren't interested in entertaining subdivision, then there is no sense in sending them to the zoning board.

Mr. Logan – Well, personally the density is already over what the density is allowed for there. They are not crowding it any further with that one parcel. I personally do not see a big challenge with it unless they have to jump thru a lot of issues with environmental and wetlands and just in general. It's not a conservation area so.... It's just me talking. I do not know how you guys feel.

Chairman Santoro – I think we can work with it.

Mr. Logan – I think you're getting the sense that we are not really objecting to this. It looks like it'll fit. It is a nice big parcel to cut in half and not really being utilized. It is natural land for deer and wildlife and everything else so you would be putting a house there. I guess I would be interested to see what our Conservation Board has to say.

Mrs. Christopher's comment was inaudible.

Mr. Logan - I am just wondering about our Conservation Board if they have had a chance to look at this and consider if there is any affects from them. I would say in general it sounds like we are amenable to it. I guess if you can talk to the Conservation Board and get their impression of what they see for that parcel. Maybe they want do a site walk with you or something like that to get a better sense of how that would fit within the woods and natural surroundings for wildlife. I think they would be your next hurdle other than a variance.

Mrs. Christopher – So talk to them before applying for variance?

Mr. Logan – I would suggest that. It would be a good idea.

Chairman Santoro – I think it is a good plan.

Mr. Logan – Good. I appreciate you coming to us.

Chairman Santoro – Brian are you here for a particular one?

Brian Emelson – No, just here if anyone had any questions about Piper Meadow.

Chairman Santoro – Joe Hurley, Kettle Ridge Farm.

### **JOE HURLEY – KETTLE RIDGE FARM**

Log Cabin Road

Zoned – Residential 2 (R-2)

Owner – Joe Hurley

Applicant would like to discuss three projects for Kettle Ridge Farm (1) honey building (2) new maple sugarcabin (3) possible shed/barn for farm animals.

Mr. Joe Hurley – Good Evening, my name is Joseph Hurley and my wife and I live at 249 Benson Road. I own Kettle Ridge Farm, LLC, which owns the 11 acre property at 515 Log Cabin Road. That is used as the base operation for the Kettle Ridge farm maple and honey farm. This is my son Chris Hurley, who manages the farm as one of two full time employees, who lives with his wife Megan in the 3 bedroom log home that sits on the property. Our business transition plans calls for Chris to become sole owner of the farm in the not too distant future. Our intention is to expand and improved the farm business by constructing three new farm buildings at Kettle Ridge Farm. We come before the Planning Board prior to submitting an application for site plan review, in order to solicit your input, any suggestions you have, any caution and concerns and perhaps a bit of encouragement for moving forward.

Before describing the particular building projects I would like to give you a three minute review of Kettle Ridge Farm. I began maple syrup and honey in 2010 under the name Kettle Ridge Farm at home on Benson Road following a 35 year career as a tax CPA and author. I came before the Planning Board in 2014 seeking and receiving a variance to construct a building for maple and honey processing at that location. While finalizing construction plans, I discovered that 515 Log Cabin Road had come up for sale and quickly switched gears. It seemed to be the perfect location for my farm business. Plenty of maple trees, a couple of out buildings and spectacular setting with high forested ridges and kettle hole ponds that fit our name Kettle Ridge Farm. 515 Log Cabin Road is also situated on a sparsely populated street, it adjoins the thruway and there are only two neighboring residences in direct view of the property. 515 Log Cabin Road was included in the agricultural district.

In 2015 Kettle Ridge Farm began producing maple syrup and honey there. I added a small flock of egg laying chickens and started growing shitake mushrooms on fresh oak logs. Chris joined the business on a full time basis in 2015, since then we have also offered several agricultural themed events to the public. Including educational tours, our adopt a maple program,

NYS maple weekend farm to table dinners and our annual kettle fest. We even have a pancake food truck that travels to office parks and events to serve up pancakes with our pure maple syrup.

Kettle Ridge Farm has been good to the Town of Victor and the Town has been good to Kettle Ridge Farm. We have attracted thousands of visitors to the farm and generated considerable press coverage as well as a strong support of local tourism agencies including: Visit Rochester and Visit Finger Lakes. Our tour groups have included school classrooms, inner city scholars, brain injured adults, garden clubs and scout troops. Our adopt a maple program has been joined by people from 49 states and even a few foreign countries. We constantly hear positive comments and encouragement from visitors. Many have told us they love what we are doing and first time visitors often wonder how they have never heard about Kettle Ridge Farm before. Victor's comprehensive plan rightly emphasizes the importance of agriculture and agriculture tourism to our town. We believe our approach to agriculture and focus on maple and honey is particularly beneficial; as everything we do actually helps sustain our natural resources and the environment. We use no pesticides, herbicides or other chemical inputs on our farm. Because residential and commercial development in Victor, inevitably leads to few forests and wildflowers, our embrace of the resources helps maintain the balance our community deserves.

The purpose of these three new buildings is to make our farm safer and more comfortable for our employees, our volunteers and our visitors. They will also enable us to further grow our business as growth will be necessary to make the farm financially sustainable. The business ultimately must be able to support Chris and his family, as well as other employees. We recently hired an army veteran with a background in natural resources and hope to add more employee's in the future. I have some maps put up there on the screen, I think you have hard copies as well showing the location of the three buildings on the property on Log Cabin Road. The top structure is what I am calling the horse barn for now. Just below that is the honey house and then further south is our new sugar house.

Let me talk first about the honey house, this would be a one story metal barn 32 feet wide, 48 feet long. The barn will be divided into 3 rooms: one for heated storage, one for honey extraction and one for unheated storage. The two storage rooms will have overhead doors to the outside. The extraction room will have an 8x10 entry that might also be used as a self-serve farm stand. The barn will have electricity and water but I don't see any need for septic since there will not be any waste water. The second building is our sugar house. This would be located where we have an old metal shed and fire pit. The current metal shed which is built from telephone poles and corrugated metal will be torn down. The new sugar house would be 52 feet wide and 60 feet long and divided into two main areas. One area would be a 40x60 uninsulated room to be used for maple syrup production as well as to shelter tour groups and other Ag tourism events. The second portion of the building would be 12x60 and will house maple production kitchen as well as bathrooms. This building will have a wood board and batten exterior and metal roof. It will also have its own septic system. The third building is the horse barn, this will be used to house farm animals, perhaps a horse, goats or mini donkeys. The main purpose of the animals is to help attract visitors, pull wagons at our Ag events and maybe experiment with goats' milk and other animal products. I don't really have a clear idea how large this building will be, perhaps a couple hundred square feet. It would be located as I showed you, just north of the honey house and there would be a water hydrant in the barn.

So that's the overview of what we hope to do there on Log Cabin Road. I hope that you can tell me where I need to focus and concentrate on.

Chairman Santoro – You need to give us some idea about parking?

Mr. Hurley – Parking, we have on the property, there are two driveways and there is the paved driveway leading up to the house and then there is a gravel driveway on the level portion down below the house. This is the main driveway going up to the house which is elevated and then we have a gravel driveway just below the main driveway which is on the flat area leading back to the sugar house area. This portion of the property is used for parking so it's a large grassy area. I think it'll accommodate between 100 or 80 cars. Right there. We actually put some gravel down recently just to make sure it doesn't get to muddy during the big rain events.

Chairman Santoro – Al (Benedict) you're here for this one too right? Or not. I leave it totally up to you.

Mr. Benedict – I have spoken to Joe on a few different projects and this is, if you had heard, in the middle of writing a code called Agri-tourism and it basically supports everything that Joe is trying to do. All he is asking for at this point is he has buildings that are going to be oversized which would require him to come before this board to ask for review and approval. I think he is looking for some direction as to whether he is okay to leave them where it is or if there is more information that you need before he makes an application.

Mr. Seiter – I like the concept. I would like to see the specifics. How to solve the parking at the events and what not. Lighting.

Chairman Santoro – All of that.

Mr. Logan – I love this stuff! (laughs) These farms are great. I have been to a lot of them, not just in Victor. We go to Vermont and all over New England where you can find them. We do have a number of them here in town so I certainly support your business and look forward to working with you on getting this situated the right way. Ernie's comments about the parking notwithstanding, I think the sides of the buildings are so close to the thruway. You got some wetlands, the kettles and things like that that are around and your neighbors would probably be your only hindrance. I would support the concept.

Mr. Gallina – I agree with everything that has been said. I like the concept, somewhat like the last applicant, might be good to have the Conservation Board walk the areas that you are contemplating putting structures. I think it's a good idea. Certainly would be supportive of working with you on it.

Mr. Hurley -- Thank you. The other thing that Al mentioned in the Agri-tourism proposed code changes, there is also a uniform fire prevention and construction code, which I think is already passed into law which will govern a lot of what we build on the property. Because it is specific to maple sugar house operations and some exceptions to the general rules for under the construction code.

Mr. Logan – Your conversation, your discussion was more about sprinklers, right? And different types of buildings and the exceptions that you just referred to Joe.

Mr. Benedict – The state does have the code for maple syrup. Which it says you need to have a permit, operating permits, you will provide exit signs, someone to be on a fire watch, things like that. It's one of those gray areas, it is residential but it is also commercial. I have already determined that since it is going to be commercially used you will need to at least apply for a waiver from the sprinkler code. That would be before the Zoning Board. There is also some issues of basically farm buildings that are somewhat exempt from building codes as Joe and his son go in them and that's fine. It's when you start bringing the general public into those buildings that creates an issue. That's when the building codes start to kick in as to what you have to do. Have I answered your question or not?

Mr. Logan – Kind of.

Al Benedict – I can rephrase and start again.

Mr. Logan – No that's ok. I think for zone protection, for your own protection Joe, I would be concerned about a lot of heat being generated for creating maple syrup that then would be a risk for the whole building if you didn't have some sort of fire suppression in there. Not just for the public but generally for insurance I would think. Personally and otherwise.

Mr. Hurley – That is a good point. Sugar houses do burn up occasionally but that is typically with wood fire evaporators and we use an oil fire evaporator which is much safer than wood fire. I don't think these new rules distinguish between the different types of fuel sources for the evaporators.

Mr. Benedict – I haven't read it in a while but it may require something like a smoke detector within the building or something such as you at least have some sort of forewarning it wouldn't necessarily be something that has to be connected to monitoring system or anything like that.

Mr. Logan – Carbon Monoxide?

Mr. Benedict – That may be required as well, yes. We are trying to make it easier for farmers to sustain their business. Not to put too many burdens on them.

Mr. Logan – Understood. Thanks.

Mr. Hurley - It is pretty specific like the exit has to be within a certain number of feet for any public/visitor in the building, you know things along that line.

Chairman Santoro – Well, I think you know what direction we are going in. Look forward to getting your application. Kim...

Ms. Kinsella – So your next meeting we are going to start out with a workshop on Incentive Zoning between 6 and 7. I had sent out an email to you guys to let you know that that will count towards training. So if you need training, I encourage you to attend that workshop and Mark Tayrien will be here to present and we are happy he will be in town for that. Any carry overs

from tonight will be on your next agenda along with a public hearing for Walmart remodel. The applicant wants to repaint the exterior of the store to a neutral color scheme, with an orange and blue accent color. To add a pick up sign to identify the new service. They are also requesting an expansion to the bale and recycling closure at the back of the store.

Next public hearing will be for the Bank of America ATM, that's up on the Panera site. The applicant is requesting approval for the drive up ATM kiosk with a bypass lane with signs, clearance bar and site lighting. You saw that when Panera Bread came in. I think they removed it off of their site plan at that point because there was not an ATM specifically that was going to go in there. They now have Bank of America interested in that. The next public hearing will be for Papke residence. It is a couple house additions and they are located at 7688 County Road 41. The applicant is requesting approval for two additions to the house and to go from a single family to a two family home, which would require Planning Board approval.

The last public hearing would be for Patriot Towers at 90 Baker Road. The applicant is requesting to remove the abandoned equipment, antennas, coax mounts and horizontals and install secondary horizontals on the tower that currently exist there now. Any questions?  
Thanks.

Chairman Santoro – Motion to adjourn

Motion was made by Joe Logan seconded by Al Gallina RESOLVED the meeting was adjourned at 8:17 PM.

Lisa Boughton; Secretary