

The Town of Gates **Planning Board** held one (1) Tabled Preliminary/Final Site & Subdivision Plan Review and one (1) Preliminary Site Plan Review and one (1) Concept Site Plan Review Public Hearings on Monday, October 25, 2021 at the Gates Town Hall Meeting Room, 1605 Buffalo Rd., beginning at 7:30PM

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mike Wall	Chairman
Theresa May	
Juan Ruiz	
Andrew Gartley	
Dan Schum	Town Attorney
Lee Cordero	Councilman, Town Board
Kurt. Rappazzo	Director of Public Works
Mike Ritchie	Costich Engineering, P.E.

**MEMBERS NOT-PRESENT:**

Joseph Argenta	
Ken Martin	Alternate

Chairman Mike Wall called the meeting to order at 7:33 PM and began with the Pledge of Allegiance and a Moment of Silent Prayer.

Chairman Wall, motioned to approve the September 27, 2021 Planning Board Minutes as sent to the Board.

Mrs. May second      All in Favor...Aye      Opposed....None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**OLD BUSINESS**

Chairman Wall, motioned to **UNTABLE** this application

Mrs. May second      All in Favor...Aye      Opposed....None

**PRELIMINARY / FINAL SITE PLAN & SUBDIVISION PLAN REVIEW**

**Doud Apartment Homes**

**OWNER; 898 Buffalo Rd.**

**ENGINEER: DDS Engineers, LLP**

**LOCATION: 898 Buffalo Rd**

**REFERENCES: 4/26/2021, 6/28/2021, 8/23/2021, 9/27/2021**

**(R-1-8 & BN-R) Residential & Business Non-Retail Zoning District**

Chairman Wall asked if the applicant was present to speak on the project

Cade Krueger, DDS Engineers, LLP, since last meeting has received the Town Engineers comment letter on the technical engineering aspects that need to be revised on the plan prior to final approval and resubmitted everything needed for SEQR including, traffic study, revised rendering (which he displayed) with changes from the original, which are minor, mainly in the parking lot, sidewalks and crosswalks. He also displayed an Architectural drawing, to show the proposed materials of the buildings.

Chairman Wall, on the Site-plan, just south of Apartment C, it seems like parking lot lay-out is awkward to move around, he asked, why it's designed this way (*using the drawings*) with essentially two-way traffic around the outside, instead of like the other parking lots being center loaded?

Mr. Krueger, with this one, they are a bit restricted in space there up against portions of land that RG& E plans to retain. They have had conversations with them about it and were told, they are OK with putting the parking lot right up to the property line. They were also told that (50) Fifty-feet is being reserved at the property line for laid out area for materials if needed in the future. So, due to the space restriction is why. They looked at a two-way traffic in and out and angled parking, but it makes things awkward for the garbage trucks to get in and out.

Chairman Wall you'll have to do what makes sense to the developer, but briefly looking at it, seems if it was center , like the other parking areas might actually add a few more parking spaces, but understands with the close proximity of the property lines and other obstacles.

Chairman Wall knows the Fire Marshal has looked over the plans and (1) one of his comments is, between builds D & E on the site plan, what the separation distance is between buildings?

Mr. Krueger, they are holding at (40) forty feet and have room to expand if needed

Chairman Wall it is one thing the Fire Marshal requested was to have fire access on at least (3) three sides of the buildings, so by pushing the building north, will be able to satisfy his requirements as far as having fire access on (3) three sides

Chairman Wall, flipping to the Drainage plan, (*using the drawings, C-9*) looks like a trail system leading to the canal, but looks like it's an existing access that is just being improved and maintained

Mr. Krueger, it is an unmaintained existing dirt path the they want to put in a stone path on their side to provide a connection to the existing path

Chairman Wall looking at the landscaping plan which is a very nice plan, just possibly consider foundation plantings, like maybe (5-10) five-ten feet on each sidewalk by the doors to help breakup the façade, adding a bit of greenery and color

Mr. Krueger will look into it

Chairman Wall as far as the lighting plan, the photometrics like a foot-candle or half foot-candle might not be bright enough for some of the foot area, realizing one of the concerns is light leaving the park area, but doesn't look like a concern right now because there is such a large buffer are between the buildings and the property owns to the west, but as far as lighting of the parking lot does seem like there are some dark areas in front of the buildings especially, like in front of building B & C there aren't any contours at all for a big size portion of the parking lot

Mr. Krueger will look into adding light packs and additionally adding at least one, possibly two wall packs above the garage to provide better lighting.

Chairman Wall, be sure to include in the photometrics of the Final site Plan, to be sure everything is all set

Mr. Gartley, to add to that, be sure to include the photometrics for the north parking lot

Mr. Krueger will be sure to add all to the revised plan

Mrs. May's concern is the trash bins and being secure from children and animals from being able to get in and getting hurt, as well as possibly adding sidewalks and crosswalks to the trash bins.

Mr. Krueger (*using the drawings*) by building B at the southwest corner they are providing a crosswalk to a new sidewalk that goes out to the trash area. The dumpsters between Buildings C & D is kind of naturally in the back, along some parking areas and grass areas and shouldn't be an unsafe placement. The most awkward is the one on the southside of building C, which they discussed the parking lot earlier. Not sure sidewalks can be provided there.

Mrs. May, how about dog waste stations

Mr. Krueger it's a good point and is sure the developer would be on board with having them and will propose adding (1) one station per building

Chairman Wall the updated colored elevations are very nice and appreciates it, but when final approvals start coming up would like building samples

Mr. Gartley asked if it's mainly stucco and some brick?

Mr. Krueger in not sure enough to speak on, but believes stone, stucco and brick facades, not much wood

Chairman Wall asked if Board had more questions, None, then continued to the side table

Mr. Rappazzo—No comments at this time

Mr. Ritchie—Nothing above the comment letter and did receive the Oct. 14<sup>th</sup> letter from Costich and no show-stoppers

Councilman Cordero—None

Chairman Wall, this is Public Hearing is open if anyone is here to speak for or against this application.

Ann Rossi, Charlene Dr. asked if it will be only one entrance in and out because of the traffic.

Chairman Wall as far as the application, a traffic study has been done and one thing is considered, is the level of traffic at a full build out, plus any future projects know of at this time

Mr. Krueger, there will be one entrance designated for the resident's portion of this development, but in future cases once the Doud Post building gets renovated and commercial uses come in, that's when the western part will open up with a second entrance.

Evelyn Gargen, 149 Varian Lane at the last meeting, something was said about this development buying the RG&E property, but it sounds like there has been a change

Mr. Krueger the intent is still to purchase that whole strip, they are just retaining a small (50) fifty-foot space, for a sub-station

Ms. Gargen is looking into how many feet you can build from a toxic waste site? Monroe County told her that it had to be at least (1,000) one-thousand feet, but doesn't have proof yet to back that up. She just interested in knowing since there is a toxic waste across the street next to Ezzy's Restaurant and at the end of this property as well.

Mr. Krueger to his knowledge there is set distance to be away from hazardous waste as long as the appropriate testing has been done, which it has.

Chairman Wall, will keep public notice open till this project receives final approval. Also, things this board has considered before looking at the SEQR, the Board does have:

Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) Part 1

Supplemented by:

Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by SRF Associates, last revised August 3rd, 2021

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared by LaBella Associates, dated May 5th, 2020.

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), last revised August 23, 2021.

Phase I Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment and Survey prepared by HAZEx, dated September, 2020.

Geotechnical Report prepared by Terracon, dated September 16, 2020.

SHPO letter of no impact to archaeological cultural resources, dated September 23, 2020.

SHPO letter, OPRHP, no further building concerns regarding William W. Doud Post No. 98 American

Legion, (no work proposed on building as part of this scope)  
Also, the site plans and building elevations as presented to the board

Attorney Dan Schum, at this point in time, the process of SEQR as the chairman has indicated has been on file for months Part I of the long form of the EAF and reason it is a long form is the project meets or exceeds one or more of the thresholds that would categorize as potentially subject to a full Environmental Impact Statement. The information the Chairman has indicated has been received, reviewed, as well as the public comments that have been made at one or more of the public meetings concerning this project to date. This board's job now in respect to the State of Environmental Review Act is to complete what is called Part II. There are (18) eighteen different areas of potential environmental impact that the project could have on the environment and he went through them and asked the Board to comment on them if need be (pro or con).

1. Impact on Land
2. Impact on Geological Features
3. Impact on Surface Water
4. Impact on Groundwater
5. Impact on Flooding
6. Impact on Air
7. Impact on Plants and Animals
8. Impact on Agricultural Resources
9. Impact on Aesthetic Resources
10. Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources
11. Impact on Open Space and Recreation
12. Impact on Critical Environmental Areas
13. Impact on Transportation
14. Impact on Energy
15. Impact on Noise, Odor and Light
16. Impact on Human Health
17. Consistency with Community Plans
18. Consistency with Community Character

*A copy is included with the minutes*

Chairman Wall thanked the Attorney for a thorough review and Mrs. May agreed.

Ms. Gargen one of the items was ground water and commented at one of the meetings it was discussed that a pond would be put in and a retention water would fill the pond and would get to (8) eight feet and would get drained into the canal

Attorney Schum, yes that is part of the Storm water retention program. The water that leaves this property will be sedimented free and filtered to the point that is better than most of the water

Ms. Gargen wants to know how it will be maintained and checked to be sure it's not contaminated

Mr. Krueger storm water from the site per DEC Regulations needs to be both treated for water quality then goes to the pond after treated then leaves the pond and can't leave faster from the site then it does now with the existing drain pattern. There will be a Storm Water Maintenance Agreement in place with the Town.

Attorney Schum the key to the question is the Storm Water Agreement in addition to building this facility. The Town and the developer enter into a written agreement that says the developer must have an engineering study of this property about every five-years and furnish to the Town and complete any remediation or work necessary to bring back into compliance and if they don't the Town can charge the property for the cost of that. It is an ongoing agreement between the property owner and the Town and requires the developer to hire an engineer to do the work that's necessary to confirm what was just asked by Ms. Gargen, that it's not just good in the beginning, but (5) five-years from now and so on.

Ms. Gargen wants to know if whoever maintains the canal, like Monroe County aware as well

Kurt Rappazzo, the canal authority was made aware of this project and sent a copy of the plans are apprised of the SEQR and had no comments

Ms. Gargen will double check if Monroe County knows it's being drained into the canal

Chairman Wall asked if anyone else had comments from the public, hearing none

Attorney Schum having reviewed Part II of the Assessment Form and given what the statute requires it to be a hard look, it's now the duty of the board to consider adopting a Resolution either requiring a completed Environmental Impact study or issuing a Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance based upon the information and the testimony of both the applicant and questions of the public, which is a documentation that has been furnished. Attorney Schum has prepared a proposed resolution of Negative Significance if the Board wished to act upon that and if not can require a full impact study if desired.

Chairman Wall, judging from all the material that has been reviewed by the board and the Attorney feels it is very thorough. Issues that have been brought up have been mitigated as much as can be and thinks this board is ready to entertain a motion to looking at No negative impact for duration of the project.

He continued....previous to this the Town of Gates has been made Lead Agency to this and gave All agencies a (30) thirty-day window to respond if they wanted to be Lead Agency, none came back wanting to be Lead Agency, so Town of Gates is Lead Agency on this project.

Chairman Wall Motioned finding this project a Type I Action and however based on all reviewed materials provided by the applicants, all the research the Town has done into the property and the review of the site plans itself, feels there is No negative impact to the environment and no further SEQR Action is required

Theresa May seconded. All in Favor...Aye Opposed...None

**MOTION PASSED: NEG. DEC.**

TOWN OF GATES PLANNING BOARD

SEQRA Determination for 898 Buffalo Road Associates, LLC mixed-use project

WHEREAS, 898 Buffalo Road Associates, LLC (the "Applicant") proposes a mixed-use redevelopment of a 16.01 +/- acre site at 898 Buffalo Road and adjacent lands in the Town of Gates, as described in the application, site plan, elevations, and other information submitted by the Applicant (the "Project");

WHEREAS, the Project includes the preservation and reuse of the existing vacant building (sometimes known as the Doud Post) for amenities and uses to serve the proposed apartment community and neighborhood-friendly commercial uses to serve the public, and construction of 5 residential buildings with a total of 158 +/- residential units, together with parking, landscaping, storm water management and other site improvements;

WHEREAS, the Applicant has submitted applications for approvals required for the Project which includes a Petition for Zoning Change to the Town Board requesting rezoning of the split-zoned site from BN-R along the frontage and R-1-8 in the rear to a Planned Unit Development to accommodate the proposed mixed-use development of the property;

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Town Code, the Petition for Zoning Change and materials submitted were referred to and reviewed by the Planning Board;

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has approval authority over site plan and subdivision approvals, and is therefore an involved agency for purposes of participation in the SEQRA process;

WHEREAS, on April 26, 2021, the Planning Board held a public hearing at which the Project was reviewed and members of the public were heard;

WHEREAS, on August 23, 2021, the Planning Board classified the matter to be a Type I action pursuant to the SEQRA regulations, and declared its intent to be the lead agency for purposes of conducting a coordinated environmental review and notified other involved agencies;

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has reviewed the Project, including the submission and information provided by the Applicant, including but not limited to the Petition for Zoning Change, the Part 1 of the long form Environmental Assessment form (EAF), site plans and elevations prepared by the DDS Companies, professional engineering reports addressing traffic, environmental condition, storm water and drainage, water supply, and historic resources, comments from the Town of Gates professional staff, comments from the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development, correspondence from local, state and county agencies, comments from the public, and other information.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board is the Lead Agency for purposes of the coordinated review and making the environmental determination for the Project, and has completed the Parts 2 and 3 of the long form EAF; and

The Planning Board, having taken the requisite hard look and engaged in reasoned elaboration, hereby makes this determination that the Project will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, and issues this negative declaration pursuant to SEQRA.

Date: September 27, 2021

Chairman Wall there are (2) two more steps to this project; Prelim and Final Site Plan approval as well as a rezoning that needs to happen which is at the Town Board level which is outside this board's jurisdiction. This board as of this meeting may entertain a Prelim approval in which case nothing will be done out of sequence with the Town Board which meets next Wednesday, November 3, 2021, could consider rezoning this property making this project move ahead if it's rezoned property.

Before considering Prelim approval, just have a final question. Looking at this, looks like it would be a good idea to have a (2<sup>nd</sup>) second entrance, for emergency purposes to be able to come in and out

Mr. Krueger, yes there can be a possible tie-in at the area that is already paved anyway for emergency vehicles

Chairman Wall asked if as far as the meters if it will be one master unit for the whole building or a hot box?

Mr. Gartley asked if each apartment complex will have its own meter or tying all in one and they pay utilities?

Mr. Krueger still discussing with the developer on how that will be handled

Mr. Gartley also asked if the stormwater run off the roofs will have gutters

Mr. Krueger, yes there will be gutters tied to pipes to run into stormwater facilities

Chairman Wall motioned to **Grant Preliminary Site Plan Approval for 898 Buffalo Rd. with the Following Conditions:**

- 1 The following note to be added to the Final Site Plans:
  - a. Detention Pond and Drainage coverts are to be privately owned and maintained.
- 2 Any final drainage calculations be provided to the Town Engineer for final approval

- 3 All conditions set forth by the Monroe County Dept. of Planning and Development are to be incorporated into the Final Plan.
- 4 The applicant is to provide building elevations of the proposed buildings, including side elevations, heights, pitch of the roof, in addition samples of building materials are to be presented for the final site review
- 5 The elevations of the Gas and Electric Meters for the buildings
- 6 The following note to be added to the Final Site Plans:
  - 7 A. All signage be conformed to the Town of Gates standards
- 8 The Gates Fire Marshal shall review and approve the plan prior to the final review of the project.
- 9 All necessary easements agreement is to be reviewed and approved by the Town Attorney
- 10 A detailed lighting plan including catalog cuts and photometrics are to be provided before final site review, in addition looking at the parking lots, to mitigate any dark areas
- 11 Applicant should look at adding foundation plantations at (5-10) five to ten feet from each side of the door to break up the façade adding a nice amenity to the site
- 12 The Fire Marshal has requested (3) three sides of access, to push the buildings further apart working with eh Fire Marshal for an acceptable access
- 13 The applicant is to add Pet Stations to the buildings as discussed
- 14 The applicant to address any comments from the Town Engineer’s letter dated October 14, 2021
- 15 The applicant to address any and all final comments from the Town Engineer and /or the Dept. of Public Works.

Andrew Gartley seconded.      All in Favor...Aye      Opposed...None

**MOTION PASSED: Preliminary Site Plan Approval**

---

**PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN REVIEW**  
**GATES TOWNHOUSES**  
**OWNER: Atlantic Funding & Real Estate, LLC**  
**ENGINEER: Bergmann Associates**  
**LOCATION: Canal Landing Boulevard**  
**REFERENCES: 4/26/2021, 7/26/2021**  
**PUD (Planned Unit Development) Zone**

Chairman Wall the applicant requested for the project continue to be **TABLED** and Public Hearing remains open

---

**NEW BUSINESS**

**CONCEPT REVIEW**  
**MANTISI SUBDIVISION**  
**OWNER: Joseph Mantisi**  
**ENGINEER: MRB Group**  
**LOCATION: 1010, 1020, 1031, 1036 Spencerport Rd.**  
**REFERENCES: None**  
**Residential Single Family (R-1-11) Zoning District**

Chairman Wall this is strictly a concept review, no decisions will be made on this project at this meeting, mainly a workshop and asked if the applicant was present to speak on the project?

Tom Fromberger with MRB Group, here tonight to with informal discussion on a subdivision plan in recommendation of the Town Board back on October and discussed site issues regarding drainage. Several residents living on the back side (*using the drawings/area map*) have existing drainage issues.

They are proposing (2) two buildings coming off Spencerport Rd. They feel these are consistent with the neighborhood. Their Architectural Plan (*using the drawing*) also used elevation from a recently completed project to show similarity and a summary.

Chairman Wall, understanding this is just conceptual, and not all details have been worked out, but as far as stormwater design, what are the thoughts for it? If developed as proposed there is not much room left for ponds or such like it.

Mr. Fromberger stormwater design will be NY State DEC guidelines for sure and quality controls. There are areas (*using the drawing*) depending on what they find out with grades and elevations of opportunities along the back of the property to provide some stormwater management. Usually how stormwater rules apply is, existing flow is modeled and the proposed flow is less than that, so even though they are building and infrastructure, the houses the pavement all the runoff will be reduced to at or below the existing conditions.

Mrs. May lives near, off Ford Ave and is familiar with the area and is thinking about the neighbors (which some are present), but wants to know what the value to the neighbor does thing project bring? Also, she is aware some concerns are lighting, sidewalk, greenspace and pet stations for waste, the landscaping and wants to know if there is a plan for those?

Mr. Fromberger as far as landscaping there are definite areas for berming and buffering as well as general landscaping throughout the site, which will provide connectivity to the neighborhood. There may be a sidewalk to connect to Lightwood Lane (*using the drawing*). It is a more attractive product then what is there right now. It will have a more residential look to it than a institutional look of an apartment complex.

Steve Licciardello, Town Gate LLC this will have more of a house flavor, lighting will not be commercial lighting and light up the neighborhood, there will be individual lights on the garages, similar to someone's home. If you really look at the designs, they are individual homes, just place together. As far as lighting, there will be no additional lighting in the neighborhoods. As far as dogs, people would pickup after their own dog the same as in a regular home.

Mr. Fromberger as far as garbage, it's not a central dumpster, each unit will have their own individual garbage totes

Mrs. May wants to be clear if these are rentals, who will maintain

Mr. Licciardello hasn't completed decided on these being rental to sell, but will have individual water, sewer, and electric so they can be sold individually or kept as whole to sell. It will all depend on the market, but as far as benefits to the neighbors, not being a single-family flavor, there could be a funeral home or a plaza, many other things that could, this would be a lot less impact for the neighbors and on the residents

Mrs. May being in the neighborhood, knows property value is always a big concern and knows the maintenance of the property would be huge because it could either upscale the sell of existing house or make them go lower.

Mr. Licciardello is sure she knows what is there now and is an eyesore and is sure this will be a much more improvement and as far as values is sure this project will improve the values in the neighborhood

Mr. Gartley asked they are keeping the existing driveway (*using the drawing*) or the new drive lane to the right as indicated?

Mr. Fromberger the existing driveway location is still in play because of travel distances getting traffic in and out. There was some concern expressed at the Town Board meeting of the driveway location and are open to adjusting it accommodating the needs of the folks across the street as well as the needs of this properties needs. There could be some changes, but would not have (2) two entrances and doesn't believe DOT would allow (2) two.



Mr. Gartley asked about any type of fencing around the property or just landscaping?

Mr. Licciardello there is some fencing along a portion (*using the drawing*) it was brought up at the Town Board meeting about possibly adding fencing or trees to avoid any lighting shining into homes and are will to do that.

Mrs. May asked if they would be asking the neighbors what their preference is?

Mr. Licciardello, they did actually speak with several neighbors at the Town Board meeting and they seemed to be very happy with this set up instead of a Burger King or McDonalds or commercial use type. There are really only (4-5) four to five residents in the back and they spoke with them. One neighbor (*using the drawing*) has drainage issues and they will see about trying to move some of that water onto this property and the drainage system

Mr. Ruiz envisioning (12) twelve, asked what the average square footage of the units

Mr. Licciardello the end units are ranch style are approximately 13,000 square feet and the two-story units in the center will be approximately 16,048square feet. These will be luxury units with granite countertops, stainless steel appliances, it will be leaps and bounds of what is across the street being apartments these will be townhomes. A lot of people looking for townhomes

Mrs. May asked if there will be sidewalks?

Mr. Fromberger haven't proposed any sidewalks at this time, but there could be an extension (*using the drawing*) there is some opportunities to move some things and make adjustments

Chairman Wall asked what they asked the Town Board to rezone to?

Mr. Fromberger to Multi-family (MR)

Chairman Wall asked Mr. Rappazzo if there is an additional buffer needed with Multi-Family Residential on top of the existing buffer?

Mr. Rappazzo yes a (25) twenty-five-foot setback

Chairman Wall it looks like these could be shifted around a bit to accommodate the buffer needed? He believes this Board would support a Variance free or as Variance free as this application can get, but knows the buffer will be a big one to look at. The developer will need to look at the economics and doesn't know if added the buffer will make them drop a unit or two from the plan. It's up to the developer on how it would work out.

Mr. Fromberger just looking at the plans, looks like they can slide forward to accommodate

Chairman Wall knows the Fire Marshal has looked at the plans and has no issues conceptually with what is being shown. His big thing is access on three sides of each building and it looks like it meets what he's looking for.

Attorney Schum asked if fire lots-lines go all the way up

Mr. Licciardello, yes so, they are individually protected

Mrs. May asked about the colors of the siding and the roof?

Mr. Licciardello it's a darker grey is the cedar siding and grey stone very similar to the color design in the town of Greece.

Chairman Wall asked if Board had more questions, None, then continued to the side table

Mr. Rappazzo—asked if owner occupied, would there be a HOA?

Mr. Licciardello, yes there will be a HOA

Mr. Ritchie—just double check the MRI code for setbacks

Councilman Cordero—when will they know if the units will be for rent or for sale?

Mr. Licciardello it all depends on the economics of how the market is. Right now, plan to rent as individual units. Later if it was to change they would come back to do a sub-division. The inspector will determine exactly the property wall lines for later use if need be.

Councilman Cordero thinks there may be a foot-print difference going to Condo from Townhouse

Mr. Rappazzo needs to look into, it will still be part of the MR District

Attorney Schum recommended as putting down the outlines, how big the lots are, may need a variance for Multi-family, the lot

Chairman Wall, this is a Public Hearing if anyone is here to speak for or against this application --None  
Again, No action will be taken place

Pat Ragussa wants to be sure the water issue is addressed because of the flooding in the back which has only been band aided throughout the years, but not truly addressed. She gave them photos at the Town Board Meeting. She asked what does a setback mean?

Mr. Fromberger the distance currently is showing at (30) thirty-feet and now adding (25) twenty-five feet

Carol Royal is very relieved, she thought the development was going to be apartments similar to those across the street and takes care of a lot of concerns, but is also concerned with the water issue. The previous owner had a large farm/garden and there was so much water and thinking about a development and buildings and pavement is wondering how that will work?

Mr. Fromberger it really depended on how it was farmed, it may have run right off to their property, but by regrading this area and adjusting this area by providing some sort in infiltration area or some sort of pond/dry swell where water can get captured and possible run off to the catch basins in the street

Sue Reanor is concerned with fencing and wants to know if there could be one cohesive look for this area, like berms or fence along and would give a better look to the community

Kathy O'Neil lives on Lightwood and is very relieved that it will be homes and not apartments, does have concerns, she loves the drawing, but the cars look small and is concern with parking. If a family has multiple vehicles where will they park? She is also concern with the traffic in the area. In the morning that area is busy, especially with busses is very tight.

Mr. Licciardello can add parking and will work with Planning Board, they are in the planning stages, but there is plenty of room in the front for additional spots.

Chairman Wall looking for the Planning Board to write a letter to the Town Board recommending this project. Looks like the conceptual plan is good and can work with adjustments made, as long as all the details like drainage and stormwater can get worked out. The big concerns are drainage and traffic, as well as cohesiveness, and parking. Looking at set back and making this as variance free as possible, especially with the additional (25) twenty-five feet as buffer.

He asked if the garbage was to be individual totes?

Mr. Licciardello replied yes individual totes

Mr. Gartley asked if power will be one main transformer and run off to separate meters?

Mr. Licciardello replied it'll depend on how RG&E wants to do it

Attorney Schum mechanically the Town Board could not act on the application for rezoning until SEQR is done, which is the Planning Board function. Will need an EIF and stormwater and any other issues for the board.

Chairman Wall motioned to adjourn the meeting

Mrs. May second  
All in Favor...Aye Opposed....None

The meeting was ADJOURNED at 8:44PM

Respectfully submitted,

Lily Alberto  
Recording Secretary