



William D. Reilich
Supervisor

TOWN OF GREECE

PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

APRIL 22, 2015

Work Session Began: 6:30 p.m.

Meeting Began: 7:00 p.m.

Place: Community Conference Room, Greece Town Hall

Present

Alvin I. Fisher, Jr., Chairman

Richard C. Antelli

Christine R. Burke

Devan Helfer

Michael H. Sofia

Christopher A. Schiano, Esq., Deputy Town Attorney

John Gauthier, P.E., Associate Engineer

Scott R. Copey, Planner

Michelle M. Betters, Planning Board Secretary

Absent

Daniel P. Barletta, DDS

William E. Selke

Additions, Deletions and Continuances to the Agenda

Announcements

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 22, 2015

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Old Business

1. Applicant: Fallmarc Development, LLC
Location: 75 Peck Road
Request: Minor subdivision approval for the Stonewood Manor North subdivision, consisting of 3 lots on approximately 2.62 acres
Zoning District: R1-44 (Single-Family Residential)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 058.01-02-001.1 & 058.01-02-001.211

Motion by Ms. Burke, seconded by Mr. Antelli, to continue the application to the May 20, 2015, meeting, as requested by the applicant.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Barletta	Absent
	Burke	Yes	Helfer	Yes
	Selke	Absent	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED
TO MAY 20, 2015, MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 22, 2015

New Business

1. Applicant: Timberland Development, Inc.
Location: Generally, west of Flynn Road and south of the Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation utility right-of-way (former Penn Central Railroad & Conrail railroad right-of-way)
Request: Final plat approval for the Avery Park subdivision, Section 6, consisting of 11 lots on approximately 3.78 acres
Zoning District: R1-E (Single-Family Residential)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 033.04-2-62.31

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

Richard Giraulo, LaDieu Associates, presented the application:

Mr. Giraulo: We are winding down on this subdivision. Section 6 has a cul-de-sac, and there are only one or two sections left. The only thing to add is that all the utilities are on-site. The cul-de-sac we proposed was based on the Town's draft design, with the island in the center; I would like to make that island smaller so that there is more pavement width. There is a 20-foot-wide drive lane; I want to make it 25 feet wide.

Mr. Copey: As a final plat, this application was not referred to Monroe County for review. We had no comments from our building, zoning or Fire Marshal staffs.

Mr. Gauthier: You saw our comments, which were detail-oriented. Do you have any comments? In the grading plan, you had the cul-de-sac shedding water; a suggestion that we made was that, if you used the option with no pavement in the middle, we would like the vegetation to be something other than grass—wildflower perhaps, unless the first buyer expresses interest in maintaining that area; we could explore that. The other suggestion was that you explore lowering the capacity of the rear yard inlet systems.

Mr. Giraulo: We are willing to discuss that.

Douglas Dobson, 1630 Edgemere Drive: I'm curious about the diameter of the cul-de-sac and what it requires for snow plowing.

Mr. Gauthier: We typically do not use our standard snow plows in cul-de-sacs. Snow plowing a cul-de-sac is a two-step operation, where the first sweep is with our standard truck, but then a large 4 x 4 pick-up truck is used to clean up the end of cul-de-sac. Ideally, in a perfect world, we would get more mileage out of the large standard-size trucks, but we will have to check with Mr. Feeney in the Department of Public Works; he is more familiar with the requirements and what can be done. I would think that wider pavement would be better.

Mr. Dobson: The cost is passed on to all the taxpayers.

Mr. Sofia: The diameter of the cul-de-sac was preapproved. Is that what will be used?

Mr. Gauthier: We are trying to find the proper shape and size for cul-de-sacs, so we have given designers the option to use the draft design from 2011; we are trying to find the right balance.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 22, 2015

Motion by Ms. Helfer, seconded by Mr. Antelli:

WHEREAS Timberland Development, Inc. (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece (the "Town") Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a final plat, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property generally located west of Flynn Road and south of the Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation utility right-of-way (former Penn Central Railroad & Conrail railroad right-of-way); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. The Planning Board completed its environmental review of the subdivision pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA") when the preliminary plat was approved by the Planning Board.
2. This final plat is in agreement with the preliminary plat. Therefore, SEQRA requires no further environmental review by the Planning Board.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Barletta	Absent
	Burke	Yes	Helfer	Yes
	Selke	Absent	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED

Ms. Helfer then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Antelli, to approve the Proposal, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall develop the Premises in conformity with all details of the Proposal as presented in the written descriptions and site development plans, as orally presented to the Planning Board, and as set forth herein. In the event of any conflict among the oral or written descriptions of the proposal, the site development plans of the proposal, or the requirements or restrictions of this resolution, the Applicant agrees that the Planning Board shall determine the resolution of such dispute.
2. The Town's 2001 Community Master Plan Update (Clough, Harbour & Associates, September 2001) contains current and projected population growth; an inventory and analysis of public, private, and semi-private recreation facilities, both active and passive; and recommendations for future actions. Based on this document, the Planning Board finds that the Town currently needs, or will need, additional park and recreation space in the vicinity of the Proposal. The Planning Board further finds that development of this subdivision will contribute to the demand for additional park and recreation space, and that this subdivision provides no suitable park or recreation land to address such current or future need. Therefore, pursuant to New York State Town Law, Section 277, payment of the Town's recreation fee shall be required for each building lot in this subdivision, payable to the Town upon the issuance of the original building permit for each house. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.
3. In accordance with Condition #5 of the Planning Board's August 7, 2002, preliminary plat approval of the Avery Park subdivision, one (1) street tree shall be provided for

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 22, 2015

each building lot. Trees shall have a variety of no more than 3 species, all subject to approval by the Town's Tree Council, and shall have a diameter at breast height of 1-1/2 inches.

4. No preconstruction meeting shall be scheduled unless and until a Notice of Intent (NOI) has been filed with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (the "NYSDEC").

Throughout the life of the storm water permit (from the filing of the Notice of Intent to the Notice of Termination), the developer shall comply fully with all aspects of the NYSDEC General Permit No. GP-0-15-002, particularly Part IV, which describes:

- periodic inspections of the construction site by a qualified professional; and
- maintenance of a site log; and
- stabilization requirements; and
- maintenance of sediment traps and ponds during construction.

The periodic inspection reports shall be provided to the Town's Engineering staff within 24 hours of inspections.

5. No final approval signature shall be placed on the plans unless and until the appropriate easement documents have been prepared and provided to the Town for review.
6. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until the appropriate easement documents, including all necessary map references, have been filed in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk. The Liber and Page of easement filing shall be referenced on final as-built record drawings provided to the Town.
7. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until this final plat has been recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk. The Liber and Page at which this final plat is recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk shall be indicated on the approved, signed copies of this final plat that are submitted to the Town. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.
8. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until a digital copy of the plans has been submitted. All sheets in the drawing set, with all necessary signatures and the Liber and Page at which this final plat is recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk, shall be provided in Tagged Image File (".TIF") format at a minimum resolution of 400 dpi.
9. Subject to approval by the Town's Commissioner of Public Works and Deputy Commissioner of Public Works for Engineering.
10. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
11. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include designees, successors and assigns.
12. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.
13. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, the Applicant shall work with Town Engineering regarding the size and configuration of the center island of the cul-de-sac and lowering the capacity of the rear yard inlet systems.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 22, 2015

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Barletta	Absent
	Burke	Yes	Helfer	Yes
	Selke	Absent	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 22, 2015

SITE PLANS

Old Business

1. Applicant: Crescent Beach Restaurant and Hotel, LLC
Location: 1372, 1384 & 1390 Edgemere Drive
Request: Site plan approval for the following changes to the site of an existing restaurant: addition of concrete patio on the north and east sides; revised parking lot layout; removal of an accessory structure (one-car garage); and related utilities, grading, and landscaping, on approximately 2.6 acres
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 035.09-1-21, 035.09-1-22, 035.09-1-23

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

Richard Giraulo, LaDieu Associates, presented the application:

Mr. Giraulo: We have made some changes and some headway on this project. The owner could not be here tonight; he is in Toronto. I will walk through the changes, and some of the changes that the Board was looking for at our previous meeting. I see this as a three-phase project to get to where we want this project to end up. The owners would like to get the facility open and generate some income to help pay for some of the costs; they want to do that without a lot of site work. It's the inside of the building that they really are trying to fix up and get it opened again. The first thing would be, what can we do to kind of minimize expenses to the site and get this opened? Right now, they control only a portion of the property that formerly was owned by one owner; that consists of the parking lot in front of the building and extra property immediately to the west of the building. The owner of the restaurant site does not control the lands owned by Lake Edge, LLC, to the west of the restaurant's parking lot; there is no plan to do any parking on Lake Edge's lands. We need to focus on where we can park on the property that the applicant controls, and how can we improve that. Crescent Beach Road will stay exactly where it is; there is no intent to change that. However, we all realize that no one is satisfied with it where it is; it's not in a good place for the owner, the Town, or the residents. It creates hazards for people visiting the restaurant. We show it where it always has been; the Town has an easement, and that is staying. Based on some feedback from the Town, we have added a striped island between parking spaces and Crescent Beach Road, so that snow could be plowed westward across our parking lot and use this area to the west to pile snow up in the winter. We have an area for our employee parking on the western side of the site. We would leave the main lot for visitors to the site. We are proposing new concrete patios; we kept them in the same area where there previously was outdoor usage. They have torn out the old patios; they were cracked and starting to lift up. Our intent is to put back some new patios, and have some underdrainage to meet the new storm water regulations. Our intent would be to install new patios, pick up the roof downspouts, and put under the patio perforated storm water piping; this would allow the storm water to soak into the sandy soil. We will get those improvements put in under the patio so that we don't have to come back and address that at a later date. The owner intends to do a minimal amount of work in the parking lot: initially, put a one-inch-thick overlay on the area in the front up to the roadway, to kind of clean it up and make it more pleasant when you come to the parking lot. Also, at one time we talked about doing some work in the right-of-way of Edgemere Drive. In Phase One, what you see on the plan right now is a rope-and-post guiderail along the front—which

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 22, 2015

provides a nautical theme—to eliminate people from driving just anywhere they want to. The intent at this time would be to use the Crescent Beach Road right-of-way access for access to the property. An option might be to remove some of the pavement, but I'm not sure where our permanent entrance may end up. In Phase Two, as the restaurant acquires the other properties, he will want to put up pavilions and tents on the patios, which would require more parking and additional land. At that point, we would provide a revised site plan to accommodate the extra use. Phase Three is to work on getting Crescent Beach Road in a better location through the parking lot. The Town has expressed some interest in helping facilitate that, and the owner wants to pursue that; however, it's something that would have to be planned out, probably for the year 2016 or 2017. I hope that the intent would be to get Crescent Beach Road over as far west as we can, to get patrons parked in front of the restaurant and not have folks walking across a live roadway. It will take time to get to the final product, but certainly it's headed in the right direction.

Mr. Copey: The Monroe County Department of Planning and Development and the Monroe County Review Committee reviewed the proposal and had some comments about the parking area and separation of the roadway. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ("NYSDEC") noted the need for a wetland permit because the parking lot is in the buffer area of a state wetland; even the repaving of the area will require that. If there is any disturbance between the site and the high water level on Lake Ontario, additional permits would be required. At the last meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals, they approved some variances for pavement setbacks. The Fire Marshal had comments regarding fire doors and access to the fire department connection. The Building Department had some questions regarding the elevations and slope of the patios, storm sewer connections, outdoor kitchens and some catch basins; they also noted a light pole in the easement area for the roadway, and asked whether or not that would be approved. We received a April 20, 2015, letter from Christopher Kehoe of 1418 Edgemere Drive; he expressed concerns about the delay of the development of the site. The current developer has had access to the site, use of the site, for quite some time now and there have been a number of delays along the way. I suspect that this letter, which all the Board members have a copy of, reflects the concerns of the other neighbors in the area. Mr. Kehoe has some questions: will there be neighborhood meetings, how will the neighbors be kept apprised of things as they develop, and a timetable established for cleanup and development of the site. We have had discussions with Mr. Giraulo and the developer about staging and approvals on this project to get them in a position to open a restaurant and deal with relocating Crescent Beach Road later. We have talked about the need for establishing the presence of that road, the boundaries of that road, and be able to identify it for traffic safety.

Mr. Gauthier: In general, our big issues are drainage from a regulatory compliance standpoint, understanding what the requirements are, and how those will be tackled. In the end, the difference between it triggering the NYSDEC regulations and just having to comply with the Town regulations, it's going to come down to administrative matters. We are not going to do management of storm water quantity; it will be quality management. Because this site is right on the water; it will be important to control erosion and sedimentation during construction. Traffic safety will be a concern. Exactly how the building utilities are connected to the public utilities is a concern. That's the other part of the Crescent Beach Road location; it's not just the road, it's the infrastructure that's within the road that needs attention. The whole right-of-way easement, it's a hybrid situation that nobody likes. We have a shared responsibility within the area that is used as the right-of-way, and we need to find a way to fairly and actively to share the responsibility to improve the safety and put in a new roadway with all the utilities in it that can service the public and be maintainable without the kind of safety concerns that the existing one has. The biggest challenge that we

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 22, 2015

have is to find a fair way of dealing with all the uncertainties; we have do it in way that can be managed and meet everyone's needs.

Mr. Fisher: Before this Board would act, we want the staff to obtain input from the developer to answer the questions that have been raised; then, they would make a recommendation to us regarding the technical issues. It's fair to say that we would not act on this application tonight, but will provide an opportunity for the Board and the public to raise issues, and give the applicant an opportunity for respond to those.

Mr. Kehoe, 1418 Edgemere Drive: I'm three houses away from the site. You had mentioned the drainage. The biggest issue that I have is the drain that was plugged late last summer; I'm assuming that the Town plugged it. The drainage is already an issue, plus the site has had numerous water leaks that have been pumped down the road. What will be done with that drainage? The biggest thing is that we want to know the process. We were told two years ago that it will be open in August of 2013, then we told last year that it would open in August 2014; now we are into 2015, and the site is still a mess. I don't know who cleaned up the rock pile that was there and I don't care, but the site still is a disaster. I don't care what's going on in the interior. The owner's absence tonight shows where his care and concern for the restaurant are, and the residents that he is going to have to deal with for years to come. I think we just want to know the process, and where our outlet is. We have lived this with for an extended period. The safety regulations that you were talking about, you don't have a way to get into the property? What is going to be different this time? We want some type of schedule, timely updates, and who from the Town do we contact?

Mr. Fisher: First, a part of the process is site plan review, so that the Town knows exactly what is being planned or any changes that are made. This is done in the public forum so that it helps to communicate it to you, and allows you the opportunity to react to it. People may say that it's going to open or not be open, but this is an essential step in the process to open the restaurant. This gives you an opportunity to raise issues and tell the Town about your concerns so that we can make sure that those issues are addressed. If for some reason there is an issue that we can't take care of as part of the site plan process, then we will refer to whoever the right staff person might be.

Mr. Gauthier: Until the site plan approval takes place, I don't think that there is anyone at the Town that can give you a date when this is going to happen. The schedule begins when the gavel comes down on the final site plan approval; beyond that, it's speculative.

Mr. Copey: Even then, the schedule for opening is out of the Town's control; we have to be clear about that. We can't make the applicant buy property, we can't make him build a building, we can't make him pave a parking lot; we only can give him approvals to do those things.

Mr. Schiano: It does not even make sense to start on the work until the approval because there could be changes.

Mr. Gauthier: It's fair to say that we have no schedule; nothing can happen until a site plan is approved. There are elements that neither we nor the developer have control over.

Mr. Fisher: This is a step in the process, letting the Town and the neighbors know exactly what is going to happen; this is your opportunity to raise issues. You live next to the site; you may be aware of issues that we may not be. That is one reason why a site plan presents an opportunity for people to raise those issues before approvals are granted.

Mr. Kehoe: That's what we have been waiting for, for two years now. We would like to see a schedule. From May of 2013, when we had the initial meeting, there has been nothing until Supervisor Reilich's letter of January 5th. We have seen this building deteriorate; it's

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 22, 2015

not even fully sided. Pieces are flying off and into our yards. The roof is flying off where they cut a dormer. Where is my outlet?

Mr. Fisher: If there are specific items, the Building Department would be the ones to address them.

Mr. Gauthier: The Town's Code Compliance staff took care of the rock pile; any building issues should be directed to them.

Mr. Copey: Here is my card; I'm the point of contact for Planning Board issues. That is the action that is happening now. We have had code compliance issues with the property owner. We have had them in court, and the rock pile has been removed. They now have a permit to work on the building. We held their feet to the fire; we would not give them a permit until they submitted a site plan application.

Mr. Kehoe: What is the permit for?

Mr. Copey: Interior work. The developer wants to do this project and we want to approve it and see it be successful. Feel free to call me.

Mr. Sofia: It was kind of premature of the owner to announce when he would open because he hasn't come to this board before now. Unfortunately, you don't see that; you see an announcement. After this is approved, when it will be finished still will be unknown because the developer has to carry out the work, and we can't force him.

Mr. Fisher: This is a positive step, a necessary step, which they have to go through before the other steps can occur. It provides an opportunity to interface with the developer and at least get the latest information.

Mr. Kehoe: I appreciate that we are going in the right direction. We just want to know what the plan is. Crescent Beach Road is an issue, and what to do with that surface and how it's being handled. In its present state, it's no good for anybody, so if there is something that comes out of this that helps that condition, then that's a positive.

Kevin Cleary, 1432 Edgemere Drive: When was the permit issued to demolish the breakwater? I never received notification.

Mr. Copey: There was not a permit required for that work.

Mr. Cleary: You see that it led to a complete disaster.

Mr. Copey: Permits don't necessitate a public meeting. There would not have been notification. If there was an environmental permit, like a NYSDEC Article 15 permit, that would be different; however, this wall was above the high water mark.

Mr. Cleary: It created a big disturbance, and then the pile of rock sat on the site forever. There was a 2004, 2005 proposal for a conference center. I'm sure that you know that Crescent Beach Road was proposed to be moved then. I have lived there for a long time and have come to all the meetings. There are lots of proposals but here we are, 10, 11 years later, and the Town has done really nothing for the residents. I complained two years ago, there are not lines on the road, no street sign. In the 1400 block of Crescent Beach Road, we pay more per square foot of taxes for our property than anyone else. We pay this for the wonderful view, and our view is not that great right now. The Town owes the residents something. We pay almost \$4000 in taxes we have the worst road, no markings or signs; that's my frustration.

Mr. Fisher: It's best for everyone to move Crescent Beach Road over to the far west for safety, and rebuild it. The street sign is a good idea.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 22, 2015

Mr. Cleary: These issues were brought up at the Town Board meeting and nothing has been done. I have not seen any action.

Mr. Fisher: Well, this board is where the details and specifics are reviewed.

Mr. Cleary: I don't think that anyone would complain about the 2004 proposal for the road; it looked good and well designed. Since 2004, the property has been a disaster. It has been going downhill, and we've heard nothing but false promises. The owner won't even show up to the meeting to answer questions. It's a joke. He did not even finish shingling the exterior; there is water going inside. I encourage you to take a peek inside; it's sad. A lot of money could be made here.

Cathey Manley, 1154 Edgemere Drive: This is the first time that I've been to a meeting. I own five properties on Edgemere Drive, and our family has been there since 1920. I think that Phase Three should be in Phase One; that whole road is a disaster. What happened to eminent domain, take the property and work it out? Put something there.

Mr. Schiano: Eminent domain is a constitutional issue. The Town could take someone's property, but the property that we are talking about in Phase Three currently is someone else's property, and the developer is in negotiations to buy it. Until they buy that property and have the legal authority to do something with it, it really is not before this board.

Ms. Manley: Wasn't that part of the Barry family lands? Anyway, you're wasting money and time, to wait to put that road in.

Mr. Schiano: It is not before this board at this time.

Ms. Manley: It is a disaster waiting to happen.

Mr. Fisher: It is our desire to see that road improved, too.

Douglas Dobson, 1630 Edgemere Drive: I've been there for almost 40 years. In these last two years, the property has looked its worst. We were proud to have Mr. Barry as our neighbor and restaurant operator. Has this application been looked at?

Mr. Fisher: This is the first time for site plan review; we have had a concept review previously. They were before Town Board for special use permit for a restaurant about a year ago.

Mr. Dobson: What about light spill? Has that been addressed? What about the sump pumps? We could not let our grandkids go down there because of the dirty water. I witnessed a neighbor step in a pothole there and twist her ankle. Can they just discharge to the lake?

Mr. Fisher: I believe so; not into the street.

Mr. Gauthier: It's lake water that's coming into the building.

Mr. Dobson: When I was on the Town Board, we required folks to tie the sump pumps into storm drains.

Mr. Gauthier: When there was water sitting on the ground out there, it was due to the sump pumps discharging in the vicinity of where a catch basin had collapsed. There is more water coming to the building at a quicker rate than it is infiltrating into the soil. When I spoke of Crescent Beach Road being a problem in the parking lot, it's not just the road; there is an entire structural system.

Mr. Dobson: I would like the discharge to be pumped into Buck Pond; that's the filter. There is no "Stop" sign where Crescent Beach Road comes into the west end of the parking lot; it's dangerous. What about the storage lockers? Earlier this year, someone thought

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 22, 2015

that they were garbage dumpsters. The Town's code enforcement people took care of it, but those should be moved. Noise is a concern; I hope that that will be addressed.

Mr. Schiano: The construction storage sheds will be temporary.

Diane Pettifer, 1760 Edgemere Drive: I have lived there 40 years. I really want to see the restaurant open, but my comment is that the site looks pitiful; it's shameful. Don't they have to have a breakwater?

Mr. Fisher: We will ask the applicant.

Mr. Giraulo: The breakwater has been partially reconstructed with large rocks. It's not completed yet, but we will be out there to survey it; most of it is in place.

Mr. Sofia: I wish that the owner was here to hear the passion from the concerns from the neighbors, who ultimately will be the restaurant's customers. Mr. Giraulo, I hope that you will pass these comments on to your client. I know that this driveway/roadway is an issue, and I know that it is temporary, but the design has to be as permanent as it's going to be because the reality of it is that that temporary driveway/roadway could be where it is for years to come. The paved asphalt area isn't going to be sufficient to stop traffic from going through the parking lot. You have a proposed a temporary rope rail. What is the purpose of it and what would be the future of that?

Mr. Giraulo: The intent is to take out some of the asphalt from the parking lot, right up to the shoulder of Edgemere Drive.

Mr. Copey: I thought that that area was going to be grass.

Mr. Fisher: Then that should be done right away.

Mr. Sofia: At the southwest corner, why don't you have temporary rope or wood? It will invite drivers to go in and out of there; that has to be defined also. If you're driving down to the Crescent Beach restaurant, it has to be defined in black and white as where to go, as if it was a road. I'm sure that the Town will work with you as to exact width and grade, etc. But it should look and act like a road, and should be clearly defined like a road. This Board puts an emphasis on getting grass and landscaping; I don't see any here. This site is of importance to the neighborhood and the Town. You keep making reference to the money spent inside; the outside is just as important. The developer should think that through because it's a reflection on his business. On the northwest side of the parking lot, I don't see any definition.

Mr. Giraulo: If this were new, we would not be here. It has been like this for 50 years, now you dump it all on the new guy. It was this way when the Barry family had it, and everyone lived with it. I don't think that it's fair to say that all of this is the fault of the developer. It's complicated: who owns the road, who is responsible, who maintains it? There are disagreements there; that's the complexity of it.

Mr. Fisher: You have been through enough site plans with us to know that when an existing property comes back to the Planning Board, we treat it as an opportunity to make improvements. For example, landscaping may not have been required 50 years ago, but I don't think that it's unreasonable or excessive cost to put grass along the front of the parcel where there is not an access point to Edgemere Drive, to help define the section of the road.

Mr. Sofia: I disagree with the idea that it is not the current owner's problem. He is the applicant, he is the one that is proposing a project, and this is the time for us to make corrections. When the last project came through, we made those recommendations.

Mr. Schiano: The Barry family had the entrance in the middle of the parking lot.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 22, 2015

Mr. Sofia: We have had many applicants come before this board with a concept plan after they bought a property, to get a feel for what they will have to do. This applicant chose not to do that, for whatever reason. The desire to minimize expenditure of funds does not relieve the applicant from the responsibilities that he will have; this has to be done right. We are not going to have the opportunity to fix it again, for a long time. The pavement that is marked is not owned by the applicant yet?

Mr. Giraulo: Correct, they are trying to acquire the property.

Mr. Sofia: So, we have to make sure that that part is not being utilized in this application. If you're going to use rope to delineate areas, you should do it all the way around the whole perimeter.

Mr. Giraulo: The developer's intent is to acquire those properties and make them part of the project, and make it work much better.

Mr. Sofia: I'm not talking about improvements on the area that the developer doesn't own; I'm saying that that area has to be defined as not being used at this time.

Mr. Giraulo: As far as the roadway is concerned, any direction on how the developer should proceed?

Mr. Fisher: At other sites, we have had grass islands with landscaping to identify the end of the parking lot. The landscaping has to have some height to it.

Mr. Sofia: Some trees would discourage someone from cutting across the parking lot, and would be environmentally helpful.

Mr. Copey: We have to define the drive lanes. The roadway is there.

Mr. Fisher: If you proposed to move the roadway, we would be happy to modify those requirements. Given that there is no assurance that the roadway can be moved westward, and the recent performance on the site, we have to approach this site plan as if the roadway and parking lot are going to be there for some time.

Mr. Copey: What would be the cost of putting in some curb?

Mr. Gauthier: We don't want to put in something that we might tear up.

Mr. Sofia: We can't make those determinations on what ifs.

Mr. Giraulo: Well, the developer could simply walk away and not do anything. We are trying to get this thing to move forward; money is always an issue.

Mr. Sofia: This is a gigantic investment with gigantic improvements. If curbing was going to upset the financial plan to the point where the developer couldn't make a profit and therefore would walk away from the project, and then it wasn't going to work financially in the first place.

Mr. Fisher: Putting in grass is not unusual. It will make the parking lot and the roadway safer. There has to be something there, some reasonable barrier or delineation. We would recommend that there be a "Stop" sign at the intersection of the Crescent Beach roadway and Edgemere Drive. We also need to know the percent of ground disturbance, for our engineers. What was the variance that was granted for the parking lot?

Mr. Giraulo: The variance was for parking to be 15 to 20 feet from Edgemere Drive; the property already has a variance for 0 feet, previously granted. The intent is to discharge the sump pump into the lake.

Mr. Fisher: It looks like the parking is shown as being within 10 feet or so of what appears to be the property line. We'd expect that there would be grass in the setback area.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 22, 2015

Jack Costa, 1312 Edgemere Drive: I live six houses from the property. They did not have enough parking and they might park in my driveway.

Motion by Mr. Antelli, seconded by Ms. Burke, to continue the application to the May 6, 2015, meeting, as requested by the applicant.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Barletta	Absent
	Burke	Yes	Helfer	Yes
	Selke	Absent	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED
TO MAY 6, 2015, MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
April 22, 2015

SPECIAL PLANNING TOPICS

Old Business

None

New Business

None

CODE ENFORCEMENT

ADJOURNMENT: 8:25 p.m.

APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The Planning Board of the Town of Greece, in the County of Monroe and State of New York, rendered the above decisions.

Signed: _____

Alvin I. Fisher, Jr., Chairman

Date: _____