



William D. Reilich
Supervisor

TOWN OF GREECE

PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

MAY 17, 2017

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

John Geisler

William E. Selke

Jamie L. Slocum

Christopher A. Schiano, Esq., Deputy Town Attorney

John Gauthier, P.E., Associate Engineer

Scott R. Copey, Planner

Michelle M. Betters, Planning Board Secretary

Absent

Michael H. Sofia

Additions, Deletions and Continuances to the Agenda

Announcements

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Old Business

None

New Business

1. Applicant: Ridgeway Properties I, LLC
Location: 1349-1401 Ridgeway Avenue & 50 McLoughlin Road Extension
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 089.04-1-3.2, 090.09-1-16, 090.09-1-17, 090.09-1-19, 090.09-1-20, 090.09-1-21
Request: Approval for the LiDestri Hydroponics Subdivision, being a resubdivision of Lot R-3A of the Building 502 subdivision (filed in Liber 340 of Maps, Page 54) to form Lots AR-3A1 and AR-3A2 on approximately 121 acres
Zoning District: IG (General Industrial) & BP-1 (Office)

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

David Cox, P.E., Passero Associates, presented the application.

Mr. Cox: We have site plan approval for this project for Phase I. As part of the financing for the project, the bank has requested that Phase I be on its own, separate tax parcel. We are subdividing 29 acres out of the 121 acres. We will provide and file all the easements so that the new lot will have the right of access from Ridgeway Avenue and Lee Road. The lot will have two points of access with the property easement agreements in place.

Mr. Copey: The Monroe County Department of Planning and Development and the Monroe County Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal; they had no comments. The only item from Town departments is that addresses be added for each parcel.

Mr. Geisler: What is the building in the corner?

Mr. Cox: That is a leased parcel and owned by RED-Rochester; it will remain as is. It's the chiller plant for the property.

Mr. Selke: Will there be easements for the access?

Mr. Cox: Yes, from Ridgeway Avenue to and through LiDestri's property to Lee Road.

Mr. Selke made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Antelli:

WHEREAS, Ridgeway Properties I, LLC (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece (the "Town") Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a subdivision, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located at 1349-1401 Ridgeway Avenue & 50 McLoughlin Road Extension (the "Premises"); and

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

WHEREAS, having considered carefully all relevant documentary, testimonial and other evidence submitted, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the application, the Planning Board determined that the application is subject 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"), and that the application constitutes an Unlisted action under SEQRA.
2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, 1 Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all parties in interest were afforded an opportunity to be heard.
3. Documentary, testimonial, and other evidence were presented at the Meeting relative to the Proposal for the Planning Board's consideration.
4. The Planning Board has carefully considered an Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF") and supplementary information prepared by the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to supplemental maps, drawings, descriptions, analyses, reports, and reviews (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
5. The Planning Board has carefully considered additional information and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives.
6. The Planning Board has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development and the Town's own staff.
7. The Planning Board has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from nearby property owners, and all other comments submitted to the Planning Board as of this date.
8. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
9. The Planning Board has completed Parts 2 and 3 of the EAF, and has carefully considered the information contained therein.
10. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.
11. The Planning Board has carefully considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
12. The Planning Board has carefully considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.
13. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
14. The Planning Board has made a careful, independent review of the Proposal and the Planning Board's determination is rational and supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

15. To the maximum extent practicable, the Proposal as originally designed or as voluntarily modified by the Applicant will minimize or avoid potential adverse environmental impacts that were revealed in the environmental review process.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Planning Board's own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Planning Board determines that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Absent
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Selke then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Antelli, to approve the application, 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. Addresses for each proposed parcel shall be added to the plat.
3. No final approval signature shall be placed on the plat unless and until the appropriate easement documents have been prepared and provided to the Town for review.
4. Subject to approval by the Town's Chief Engineer and Commissioner of Public Works.
5. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
6. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include agents, designees, and successors.
7. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Absent
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

SITE PLANS

Old Business

1. Applicant: Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems of Allentown, Inc. (d.b.a. Verizon Wireless)
- Location: 1510 Maiden Lane
- Mon. Co. Tax No.: 059.19-3-1.1
- Request: Site plan approval for a proposed cellular service telecommunications facility, consisting of a freestanding antenna tower (119 feet-high, including lightning rod) and related antenna(s), accessory antenna structures, and access driveway, on approximately 0.13 acres
- Zoning District: R1-18 (Single-Family Residential)

Ms. Burke made a motion, seconded by Mr. Geisler, to continue the application to the June 7, 2017, meeting, as requested by the applicant.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Absent
	Fisher	Yes		

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED TO
June 7, 2017, MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

2. Applicant: DVL2, LLC
Location: Generally, southeast corner of Latta Road and Long Pond Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 045.03-4-1, 045.03-4-2, 045.03-4-3, 045.03-4-4, 045.03-4-17.11 & 045.03-4-20.111
Request: Site plan approval for a proposed medical office building (one story, 15,000± square feet), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 15.2 acres
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

WHEREAS, DVL2, LLC (the "Applicant/Project Sponsor") has submitted a request to the Planning Board (the "Planning Board") of the Town of Greece (the "Town"), Monroe County, New York, for overall site plan approval for the proposed expansion of a retail business center (5± buildings, 40,000± square feet at full buildout), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 12.84 acres, along with approval for construction of Phase 1 (the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, Phase 1 of the Project entails construction of an urgent care facility (one story; 15,000± square feet); and

WHEREAS, the Applicant/Project Sponsor has submitted to the Planning Board an application for the Project, which included but was not limited to: a project narrative; a site plan; an engineering report, which included a preliminary storm water management report (the "Engineering Report"); a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (the "SWPPP"); a traffic assessment study (the "Traffic Analysis"); and Part 1 of an Environmental Assessment Form (the "EAF"), which was prepared in part by using the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation's (the "NYDEC") online EAF Mapper application (collectively, the "Application"); and

WHEREAS, upon review of the Application, the Planning Board has determined that the Project is subject 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"), and that the Project constitutes a Type 1 action under SEQRA; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board intends to become the lead agency for the coordinated environmental review of the Project and hereby directs staff to provide notice of such intent and a request for comments to interested and involved agencies upon receipt of all necessary materials to be included with such notice; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to §617.6(b)(3)(i) of the SEQRA Regulations, the Planning Board will assume that it has received consent to become the lead agency if an involved agency does not send a written objection within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of filing a Notice of Intent to Become Lead Agency.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that the Planning Board hereby makes the following determinations:

1. The Planning Board intends to become the lead agency for the coordinated environmental review of the Project.
2. The Planning Board hereby provides an opportunity of thirty (30) days from the date on which a Notice of Intent to Become Lead Agency is distributed to involved agencies for written comment on the Planning Board's intent to become lead agency.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

3. If after thirty (30) days' time an involved agency has not provided a written objection to the Planning Board becoming lead agency, the Planning Board shall assume that it has such involved agency's consent.
4. The Planning Board hereby directs staff to file a Notice of Intent to Become Lead Agency with all involved agencies, and to notify all such involved agencies of the deadline for acceptance of written objections to the Town Board's intent, in accordance with SEQRA.
5. This resolution shall take effect immediately.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Absent
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED

Ms. Burke made a motion, seconded by Mr. Geisler, to continue the application to the June 7, 2017, meeting, as requested by the applicant.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Absent
	Fisher	Yes		

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED TO
June 7, 2017, MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

New Business

1. Applicant: New Testament Christian Church
Location: 349 North Avenue
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 073.02-1-22.2
Request: Site plan approval for a proposed pavilion (1,200± square feet) on approximately 11 acres
Zoning District: R1-12 (Single-Family Residential)

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

Dominick Caruso, representing New Testament Christian Church, presented the application.

Mr. Caruso: We would like to put up a pavilion for church events. It is about 1200 square feet, a steel structure, and will be set in concrete.

Mr. Copey: No comments from any of our Town departments. The project was not referred to the County because it falls under a threshold of projects for which referral is required. The only reason that we brought it before the Board was because Town code dictated it because it was over 1,000 feet. It's straightforward, we have no concerns.

Mr. Geisler made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Burke:

WHEREAS, New Testament Christian Church (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece (the "Town") Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a site plan, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located at 349 North Avenue (the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, having considered carefully all relevant documentary, testimonial and other evidence submitted, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the Proposal, the Town Board determined that the Proposal is subject 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"), and that the Proposal constitutes a Type II action under SEQRA. (See § 617.5(c)(7) of the SEQRA Regulations).
2. According to SEQRA, Type II actions have been determined not to have a significant adverse impact on the environment and are not subject to further review under SEQRA.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, SEQRA does not require further action relative to the Proposal.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Absent
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Geisler then made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Burke, to approve the application, 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. No building permits shall be issued unless and until a digital copy of the plans has been submitted. All sheets in the drawing set, with all necessary signatures, shall be provided in Tagged Image File (".TIF") format at a minimum resolution of 400 dpi.
3. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Commissioner of Public Works, and Engineering staff.
4. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
5. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include agents, designees, and successors.
6. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Absent
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

2. Applicant: NGPT, LLC
Location: 515 Long Pond Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 045.01-1-2.11
Request: Site plan approval for a proposed addition (one story, 6,915± square feet) to an existing physical therapy building, with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 2.65 acres
Zoning District: BP-2 (Professional Office)

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

Richard Giraulo, Landtech Associates; Terry Masci, General Contractor; and Timothy Anne, owner, presented the application.

Mr. Giraulo: We're happy to back for this project, which has been around for a long time, since about 10 years ago. We are here tonight for an addition of about 7,000 square feet, one story. It will be on the west side of the existing building on the south side of the site. The site had 51 parking spaces as a whole. This proposal would add parking up to 78 spaces; the zoning code requires 72 spaces. The business will be adding only one new therapist. Most of the addition will be for open gym space to provide better therapies and offer more options for patients' rehabilitation. Heating, ventilation and air conditioning ("HVAC") units will be added to the south side of the building, similar to what is in place at the existing building. The HVAC units will be screened from public view. The addition will be sided to match the existing building. The new construction will be a little higher and will mimic the other side. The main entrance will remain the same. The roof is brown, along with the trim, and the siding will be the greenish to match. The site is a little tricky because we are building against an existing asphalt parking lot. The parking grade is dropping away when we install this building at the same first floor elevation. We have to have a sidewalk retaining wall. As you come in flush to the building, the sidewalk is level but the parking lot is dropping away, so when you get to the door there will be a retaining wall with a railing. When we are at the west end, there will be a long ramp, which will have full compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") access requirements. If we have to sprinker the building, we will, and we will run water to the addition from inside the existing building. The plumbing will be internal from the existing building. There are sanitary sewers in the parking lot if we need them, but don't anticipate needing them. The storm drainage for the site was designed and constructed for a full build-out, so there already is a storm water management facility at the west end of the project. We still are well under the level of perviousness and in compliance with the initial design.

Mr. Copey: The Monroe County Department of Planning and Development and the Monroe County Development Review Committee had few comments. There was some discussion back and forth with Town staff about the ramp, and that will be resolved. No comments from our fire marshal or zoning staff.

Mr. Gauthier: Our comments had to do with easements, utilities, and drainage. Mr. Giraulo has responded to them, and there are no outstanding issues.

Eric Pease, 106 Constance Way East: When Dr. Fox built her building, it was beautiful, very nice. This building seems like a step down, with the vinyl siding. Also, Dr. Fox was asked to put up a fence, and I would ask if the same could be done here as well. What about the light spill with the new building? I don't want a tall pole that will light up my whole back yard.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

Mr. Fisher: We have a requirement that the light spill will not go off the property.

Mr. Giraulo: There are no site lights for the parking lot. There will be lights over the entranceway, as required by code, but we should not have any light spill issues. I don't see a need for a fence. We are 30 feet off the property line, and we also have this very large RG&E utility right-of-way between our site and the residential properties to the south. The building is really about 150 feet from the rear of these properties.

Mr. Selke: In contrast, Dr. Fox was about 40 feet from the townhomes. There are no parking lot lights?

Mr. Giraulo: That's right. The office hours are from 8:00 AM to 7:00 PM.

Mr. Selke: I have a concern about safety when it gets darker early and there will be ice and snow.

Mr. Giraulo: They might close earlier.

Mr. Masci: I believe that the hours are from 8:00 AM to 7:00 PM. There are no lights at this time in the parking lot.

Mr. Selke: Most of the folks coming to your site are somewhat physically limited in some way. We have to do the best that we can to make it easy for them to get in and out.

Mr. Copey: What about some bollard lights along the ramp?

Mr. Masci: Yes, I thought about that.

Mr. Giraulo: This is really more of an emergency exit. Everyone still will be using the main door.

Mr. Geisler: What about a wheelchair?

Mr. Giraulo: The front door will be used.

Mr. Fisher: Virtually everyone will have a physical impediment of some type, so it's more important to have additional handicap parking spaces, to have them get to the entrance safely.

Mr. Geisler: What about the sprinklers?

Mr. Giraulo: We are working with the fire marshal. Whether sprinklers will be required will depend on the building construction classification under the building and fire code.

Mr. Selke: Are all the trees coming down by the parking lot? Is the trail being used? Do they have a security system?

Mr. Giraulo: There are a few trees that will be removed, but we are not touching the trees near the south property line.

Mr. Copey: We recently completed a study of the feasibility of using the RG&E right of way as a trail; it is feasible. Now, it's just a matter of getting the money to do the work.

Mr. Geisler: What kind of brush is there in the RG&E right-of-way?

Mr. Giraulo: It's are about 10 feet high now; residents to the south won't be staring at the building.

Mr. Selke: What you're saying is, instead of a fence you have the brush to buffer some of the building?

Mr. Anne: We are not going to put any lights in the parking lot. The building will have sensors to control lights that will shine on the parking lot. It's what is there now, and has been that way for the last five years.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

Mr. Fisher: You would think that there would be more people with handicapped parking tags for their cars than the number of handicapped parking spaces that you have.

Mr. Anne: I have been doing this for about 17 years, and most of our clients with wheelchairs or walkers come in the morning; we have afternoon hours for folks who work.

Mr. Geisler: We are looking at the safety issue. Shouldn't the parking lot be lit up?

Mr. Anne: We have lights on the building, and we have spotlights on the building now and there is enough lighting at night to see. I don't want to put lights in a parking lot because it would disrupt neighbors.

Mr. Masci: We have a tall gable in the middle; we could put a light there.

Mr. Copey: There are more handicapped parking spaces than required.

Mr. Anne: The last thing I want as a physical therapist is a lawsuit. I have the sidewalks salted three times a day in the winter. I don't want anyone to fall. I want it to look nice.

Mr. Fisher: What do you propose for lighting that would illuminate the parking lot?

Mr. Anne: There are spotlights that are on the corners of the building which shine about 30 feet into the parking lot. There are about 12 total spotlights; they are double-headed lights. I don't want the site to look commercial.

Mr. Fisher: So we have identified lighting for the lot and if it's what is there currently.

Kathy Cleary, 32 Wood Run Commons: The lighting is fine now. Will it go off at night? It's no big deal, I just did not want to see a big light in the parking lot.

Mr. Pease: The lighting is fine now and anything more would be overkill. In the summer, I can't see the building, but in the winter I can, so I request that a fence be put there. This is increasing two-thirds in size, so I will be looking at a huge building.

Mr. Fisher: A fence is not going to hide a building.

Mr. Giraulo: That would be an extraordinary requirement by the Board, given the distance from the property; it's about 150 feet. The building will buffer any noise from the parking lot.

Arthur Daughton, 52 Goethals Drive: What is between the building and the edge? Why can't you put a fence there?

Mr. Anne: Grass is there. RG&E won't let us put anything there; it's not our property.

Mr. Selke made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Antelli:

WHEREAS, NGPT, LLC (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 located at 515 Long Pond Road (the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, having considered carefully all relevant documentary, testimonial and other evidence submitted, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the application, the Planning Board determined that the application is subject 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"), and that the application constitutes an Unlisted action under SEQRA.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, 1 Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all parties in interest were afforded an opportunity to be heard.
3. Documentary, testimonial, and other evidence were presented at the Meeting relative to the Proposal for the Planning Board's consideration.
4. The Planning Board has carefully considered an Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF") and supplementary information prepared by the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to supplemental maps, drawings, descriptions, analyses, reports, and reviews (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
5. The Planning Board has carefully considered additional information and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives.
6. The Planning Board has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development and the Town's own staff.
7. The Planning Board has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from nearby property owners, and all other comments submitted to the Planning Board as of this date.
8. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
9. The Planning Board has completed Parts 2 and 3 of the EAF, and has carefully considered the information contained therein.
10. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.
11. The Planning Board has carefully considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
12. The Planning Board has carefully considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.
13. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
14. The Planning Board has made a careful, independent review of the Proposal and the Planning Board's determination is rational and supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
15. To the maximum extent practicable, the Proposal as originally designed or as voluntarily modified by the Applicant will minimize or avoid potential adverse environmental impacts that were revealed in the environmental review process.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Planning Board's own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Planning Board determines

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Absent
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Selke then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Antelli, to approve the application, 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 landscaping on the Premises shall be maintained by the current owner of the Premises, and by any future owner. The owner of the Premises shall replace any dead plants with the same species or a similar species. The replacement plant shall be no smaller than the previous plant when it originally was installed. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
3. Prior to the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy for the Premises, The Applicant shall provide certification verifying proper installation of landscape areas on the site in accordance with the landscape plan approved by the Planning Board, and in accordance with the Town's Landscape Guidelines for Development. Such certification shall be on the certification form provided in such guidelines and shall be completed by a New York State Licensed Landscape Architect or Certified Nursery Professional. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
4. The exterior appearance (that is, materials, colors, and architectural style) of the proposed addition shall be generally the same on all sides of the proposed addition. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, such materials and colors shall match the existing building. Elevations of the exterior appearance shall identify these colors and materials, shall show all sides of the proposed addition, and shall be filed with the site plan.
5. Light spill shall be contained on the Premises. Outdoor light sources shall be aimed or shielded so that they are not visible when viewed from off the Premises, and so that light spill is cast only downward onto the Premises. Exempt from this requirement are low-wattage or low-voltage lights that are located near the principal entrance to a building, and low-wattage or low-voltage lights, not higher than 42 inches above grade, that define a walkway or other access to a building. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
6. The locations of the designated fire lanes shall be shown on the site plan.
7. The locations of all exterior doors shall be shown on the plan. All exterior doors shall be connected by a sidewalk to an acceptable fire safety zone.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

8. Permanently mounted "No Parking – Fire Lane" signs shall be posted along the fire lanes at intervals of 50 feet or less. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
9. No building permits shall be issued unless and until a digital copy of the plans has been submitted. All sheets in the drawing set, with all necessary signatures, shall be provided in Tagged Image File (".TIF") format at a minimum resolution of 400 dpi.
10. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Commissioner of Public Works, and Engineering staff.
11. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
12. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include agents, designees, and successors.
13. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Absent
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

3. Applicant: CC/FSI 2120 West Ridge Road, LLC
Location: 2120–2150 West Ridge Road, 26 Standish Road, 29 Ridgecrest Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 074.15-15-17,074.15-15-18, 074.15-15-19, 074-15-15-20
Request: Site plan approval for a proposed freestanding restaurant (one story; 5,000± square feet) with drive-up service window, and with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 1.5 acres
Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

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

Michael Montalto, Costich Engineers; Jerry Goldman, Esq., Woods Oviatt LLP; and Jason Pociask, Development Manager for Chick fil-A, presented the application.

Mr. Goldman: This project is located on the north side of West Ridge Road between Standish Road, which is a signalized intersection, and Ridgecrest Road. This project encompasses the corner lot, the lot next door and two former residential zoned lots which were rezoned by the Town. The zoning allows restaurants. The rezoning and the special use permit for restaurant were approved by the Town Board. As part of that process, the Town Board also issued a negative declaration, meaning no significant adverse environmental impact for this project. This site has been through the Board of Zoning Appeals and obtained all variances that were needed, including signage. The Monroe County Department of Planning and Development also has returned its review, with no comments. This will be a 5000-square-foot building with a drive-up service window. We have ample landscaping surrounding the site, and we have oriented the site and building toward West Ridge Road as much as possible. The drive-up lane is along the front of the site, on the West Ridge Road side.

Mr. Montalto: We are in receipt of a number of comments from Town staff, particularly engineering. I will start by addressing engineering. There were several comments relative to the storm water management facility. We are utilizing a subsurface storm water management facility on this site. The Town has indicated that there are some downstream capacity issues with the existing Town storm sewer. As a result, in addition to the standard mitigation relative to redeveloping this site, we had discussion with Town engineering staff relative to increasing the capacity of our on-site storm water management facility to ensure that there are no downstream impacts associated with development. We ran some calculations this afternoon, and from an order of magnitude standpoint we originally had proposed three parallel underground pipes at the north end of the site; there now would be five. We have discussed more technical details as well, in terms of just restricting flow with orifice plates and weirs to make sure that the piping is of sufficient size so that in case it does not function as intended, excess water won't get into the downstream system. We have made it a fully underground detention system, rather than infiltration because we are uphill from the houses to the north. We felt that it was not prudent to introduce into the soils any additional ground water, which could migrate subsurface or into basements. That was the largest technical concern for engineering. We did have discussion Town staff regarding light spill to the north of the property. We had two light fixtures that were throwing light onto the site. We had discussion about getting that away from the homes, so we designed it so that there would be a single light fixture that would be located behind the garage. By changing that to a Type 3 distribution, we are able to minimize any light spill and make sure that it is fully compliant with the requirement that there be zero foot-candles of light spill at the lot

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

line. There are several landscaping concerns that have been discussed. The site layout that was submitted is the same as the one that presented to the Town Board. There was a similar project down the street, where great care was taken by this Board to make sure that the drive-up service element did not create a nuisance for the vehicles traveling on West Ridge Road. We discussed with Town staff the grade difference between the drive-up lanes and West Ridge Road, and we have a photo simulation to show to you. We have concluded that westbound drivers on West Ridge Road would see the tops of cars, so we have proposed to add the wall element where suggested; it would be close to the West Ridge Road right-of-way. It will make nice barrier so that snow that's plowed off West Ridge Road will not end up in the drive-up lanes. We are offering to add a wall element that would wrap the southeast corner of the site; from a grading standpoint, it's roughly one foot down from the contours. Low level landscaping will be added in front so that it won't be just a plain wall. Great care has been taken from a landscaping standpoint; it will be garden-like and manicured. There was discussion regarding deeding some property over to the adjoining neighbors to the north. For multiple reasons, we would like that to stay in the control of the commercial entity. It is better served from a code enforcement standpoint to go after the restaurant if that area is not being maintained. The design of that area is the result of talking with the neighbors to remove the existing chain-link fence, which creates a void. That area will be manicured landscape beds, and it won't be just a lawn that will turn into weeds. I will pass out the photo simulations and renderings of the buildings.

Mr. Selke: Is this the standard design?

Mr. Pociask: This is the building architecture that we are leading with for across the country. We kept it all brick, with a different color at the top.

Mr. Geisler: Is the drive-up lane always on the road side?

Mr. Montalto: The drive-up service window is to the east; the vehicle queuing is to the south. Chick-fil-A has a lot of sites where the drive-up part of the restaurant is near the road.

Mr. Fisher: One of the things that we would expect is a four-sided treatment of the appearance of the building, and we would like the architectural elements on all four sides to be comparable in quality and appearance. The side that faces West Ridge Road is the least appealing.

Mr. Montalto: We have another sheet that shows additional architectural features for that side. You'll see that there is some additional relief, and more can be added. We also could raise the parapet. There is an awning over the pick-up window. There are two order boards.

Mr. Selke: How are you going to handle the traffic with the grand opening? Will there be parking on side streets?

Mr. Pociask: We recognize that those periods are extremely busy, so we bring in a whole grand opening team to help with our grand opening. There are about 30 to 40 people to assist with traffic and parking, and also inside the restaurant. As the weeks go by, that traffic will be reduced. We will work with local law enforcement.

Mr. Copey: I think that your best bet would be to work with them. The Monroe County Department of Planning and Development and the Monroe County Development Review Committee reviewed the plans, and noted that a permit would be required if work were to be performed in the West Ridge Road right-of-way. No comments from the Town's building department or the Ridge Road Fire District. The Fire Marshal had some comments as to marking the fire lanes on the north side of the building and having a hydrant on the site. He wanted the location of the fire department connection on the building. Mr. Montalto covered all the comments pretty well, and we appreciate the Chick-fil-A team's willingness to work with us on the lighting change; that really brought it into compliance with the Town's code

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

requirements. When I look at the photo simulations of the wall out front, I think that it's a great improvement to the look of the site, and it hides the vehicles. Looking at the south and east architectural elevations of the building, it's a little bare; I think that it needs some more detailing. The applicant has made some effort of improving the look of the building on the west side; maybe just give us some idea of what the renderings are. I think that the east side will be highly visible for westbound traffic; false windows are a great way to dress up that side of the building.

Mr. Geisler: How high will the retaining wall be?

Mr. Copey: It will seven feet. On the west side, it is lower.

Mr. Montalto: We stepped down the height of the wall as you go northward; there are tiered levels between the landscaping and the walls. Yes, it is lower on the west side. The wall element dies out at the site entrance/exit on Standish Road. It blends into the grade, it rolls back, then hits the highest point in the rear. When we get to the dumpster enclosure, we originally were maintaining one elevation, but that made a six- to seven-foot element closer to the road. It was an oversight from a drafting standpoint. We always intended to step the wall down, so that there would be no large, visual presence. You have garden area, then wall, and then we carried the wall beyond the dumpster so that there is additional screening.

Mr. Geisler: Very attractive.

Mr. Copey: We also talked about screening at the top of the retaining wall.

Mr. Montalto: The discussion was to add a higher element to block the headlights and the vegetation, without creating a high vertical element on top of the wall.

Mr. Fisher: There is a state code that requires at least a minimum fence height of 42 or 48 inches so that people, especially children, can't fall over the edge of the retaining wall. Putting a solid barrier there also would act as a barrier to lights because the site is high enough that you would be shining in second-story windows of the adjoining neighbors to the north.

Mr. Montalto: We took a close look and the two homes that are there do have windows. On the east portion of the site, there is a travel lane; however, on the west you have the cars, so we will be sure to look at modifying that. We discussed with staff putting a solid fence on top of a retaining wall, but the presence that that would create on the residences didn't appear appropriate. When the landscaping grows, it will provide additional screening. Instead, we propose modified timber guide rails, which would provide the protection from falling, and would provide additional screening and mitigate that issue.

Mr. Fisher: Is that something that a person couldn't fall under?

Mr. Montalto: We will have to work with Town staff so that the final design fits all of the codes. Another discussion was that, from a fall protection and building code standpoint, a potentially open chain-link fence would have to be added at the top of the wall. We'll have to come up with a guide rail design that provides the screening, the fall protection, and allows that area to be utilized for a snow storage.

Mr. Fisher: How do you do that?

Mr. Montalto: It will have multiple elements. Instead of using just one primary board to stop vehicles, it will have horizontal elements with the sizes and positions selected to provide screening at the average headlight height and make sure that there is not an opening for children to get through.

Mr. Fisher: I just don't understand how you allow snow to get through and not a child.

Mr. Copey: I think that the railings that are required at the top of these can be as simple as a steel pipe rail, with just a rail in the middle at a 42-inch height; if a kid wanted to get

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

through that, he could. Even if the rail were put a little higher, it would comply with code, but I think that they can address that.

Mr. Fisher: It's hard to approve something if you don't understand the concept.

Mr. Copey: Is the Board looking for something opaque?

Mr. Fisher: I want something a kid won't be able to crawl through or fall over. This restaurant will attract families, and I don't want to see some kid have an opportunity to fall. It's almost more important than the headlights; I'd like to cut the headlights, but I'd like to be sure that it's safe.

Mr. Copey: I don't know how a picket fence would work for snow plowing.

Mr. Montalto: Think of the board-on-board fence design and rotate it 90 degrees, so that instead of the traditional guiderail that might have one horizontal member, it extends higher at the three-foot range for the headlights and also has a lower horizontal member to stop children. We still have plantings as well. Any fence area close to the parking lot will affect how the storm water management area works and the free flow of water or even snowmelt.

Mr. Fisher: I'm comfortable with having those combined. I just want to be sure that it functions to prevent kids from going under; first, that it meets code and then if it's effective. Also, the east and the south sides of building have to have improved architectural treatments.

Mr. Pociask: We have no issue with addressing those concerns. We're not there yet with the changes that we have proposed so far, but we are headed in the right direction. I want clarify that adding any glass on those two sides will be very difficult because our kitchen and the bathrooms are there.

Mr. Fisher: I can be spandrel glass.

Mr. Pociask: We will take a look at how to address this. Things tend to look good on paper but don't look like you thought that they would after they are constructed.

Mr. Fisher: We use spandrel glass all the time. The westbound traffic is heaviest in all of the town, and those are going to be the people that are closest to the building, and we want to make sure that it looks great.

Mr. Pociask: We will continue to add elements to address your concerns.

Mr. Montalto: We will work with staff to address the design elements. The west and north sides are visually pleasing, and you would like to see more of those elements integrated into the building. We will provide some updated elevations, but they will have to be reviewed by staff; we will work out the exact details.

Mr. Gauthier: We sent a comment letter that contained several details concerning utilities and grading. We have discussed them with Mr. Montalto, and if I understand correctly, you take no issue with them.

Mr. Montalto: Yes, correct.

Arthur Daughton, 52 Goethals Drive: It looks good to me. Were the variance granted? For someone who know most of these people, I knock on the doors, I think the street is Ridgecrest, the kids play out here and the other big issue is the storm water management. They have to do it on-site. I have photographs. There is no drainage on that street. I don't think the developer should pay for that.

Mr. Copey: The variances were approved; one was withdrawn.

Mr. Gauthier: Our comments and the response from the developer acknowledge the existing drainage situation, and the developer's engineer had to upsize the storm water runoff storage

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

on the site. They are making sure that this project improves the situation; they are doing their part.

Mr. Selke: What are the hours of operation, and what are the shift hours? Have you designated a spot for employee parking? The area in the back would be a good place.

Mr. Pociask: The hours that we are open to the public are 8:00 AM to 10:00 PM, Mondays through Saturdays; we are closed on Sundays. We have one operator for each restaurant that we open. Operators don't get to own 30 of our restaurants, nor do they manage the restaurant from 500 miles away. Our operators are in the community. They are responsible for the restaurant, for developing their team, and are on-site on a daily basis. There are 12 employees; I'm not sure about the number of shifts.

Mr. Selke: If you take a look at Buckman's Plaza for landscaping ideas, it's nicely done. What materials will the dumpster enclosure be made of? What will the gates of the dumpster look like? Will you see the top of the building?

Mr. Montalto: The dumpster enclosure is made of masonry materials, the same as the building. The knee wall near West Ridge Road will have a pre-cast or slate coping element at the top; it will be similar to the Taco Bell at Dewey Avenue and Dobson Road. We plan to add a landscape element on the side of the wall that faces toward West Ridge Road, and the landscaping will soften the appearance of the wall. The plantings will be included in the plan.

Mr. Copey: Are the plantings salt tolerant?

Mr. Montalto: Yes. The dumpster is fully detailed on page 13 of the plan set; it's a composite material. You will not see the top; there is a parapet to hide rooftop units.

Mr. Selke: I suggest that you put in some more handicapped parking. I know there will be a lot of senior citizens that will come here during the day. Can you elaborate more on the snow storage?

Mr. Montalto: We have to be adaptable for snow storage. There is an eight-foot area at the north and an area to the west for on-site piling of snow, or it can be removed from the site.

Ms. Slocum: Will the outdoor seating be to the left of the front door? How long till you open?

Mr. Montalto: Yes.

Mr. Pociask: If you order through the online app you can pick up at the door to the left. The date of opening typically is 25 weeks, on average, from when we start construction.

Mr. Selke made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Geisler:

WHEREAS, CC/FSI 2120 West Ridge Road, LLC (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 2120-2150 West Ridge Road, 26 Standish Road, 29 Ridgecrest Road (the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, having considered carefully all relevant documentary, testimonial and other evidence submitted, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the application, the Planning Board determined that the application is subject 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"), and that the application constitutes an Unlisted action under SEQRA.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, 1 Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all parties in interest were afforded an opportunity to be heard.
3. Documentary, testimonial, and other evidence were presented at the Meeting relative to the Proposal for the Planning Board's consideration.
4. The Planning Board has carefully considered an Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF") and supplementary information prepared by the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to supplemental maps, drawings, descriptions, analyses, reports, and reviews (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
5. The Planning Board has carefully considered additional information and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives.
6. The Planning Board has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development and the Town's own staff.
7. The Planning Board has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from nearby property owners, and all other comments submitted to the Planning Board as of this date.
8. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
9. The Planning Board has completed Parts 2 and 3 of the EAF, and has carefully considered the information contained therein.
10. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.
11. The Planning Board has carefully considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
12. The Planning Board has carefully considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.
13. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
14. The Planning Board has made a careful, independent review of the Proposal and the Planning Board's determination is rational and supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
15. To the maximum extent practicable, the Proposal as originally designed or as voluntarily modified by the Applicant will avoid or minimize potential adverse environmental impacts that were revealed in the environmental review process.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Planning Board's own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Planning Board determines

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Absent
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Selke then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Geisler, to approve the application, 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. No building permits shall be issued unless and until highway permits are issued. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
3. The proposed address shall be added to the site plan.
4. Subject to approval and filing of a resubdivision map to combine tax parcels included in the site.
5. The landscaping on the Premises shall be maintained by the current owner of the Premises, and by any future owner. The owner of the Premises shall replace any dead plants with the same species or a similar species. The replacement plant shall be no smaller than the previous plant when it originally was installed. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
6. Prior to the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy for the Premises, The Applicant shall provide certification verifying proper installation of landscape areas on the site in accordance with the landscape plan approved by the Planning Board, and in accordance with the Town's Landscape Guidelines for Development. Such certification shall be on the certification form provided in such guidelines and shall be completed by a New York State Licensed Landscape Architect or Certified Nursery Professional. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
7. All heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment shall be screened from public view. If the HVAC equipment is or will be roof-mounted, the screening for such HVAC equipment shall be visually compatible with the proposed building(s), and shall be shown on the architectural elevations of the building(s). If the HVAC equipment is or will be ground-mounted, its location shall be shown on the site plan. Evidence that such HVAC equipment is or will be screened shall be submitted for review and approval by the Clerk of the Planning Board prior to affixing the Planning Board approval signature to the site plan.
8. The exterior appearance (that is, materials, colors, and architectural style) of the proposed building shall be generally the same on all sides of the proposed building.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

As offered and agreed by the Applicant, such materials and colors shall be brick (in the tan/brown/white color family), with black trim. Elevations of the exterior appearance shall identify these colors and materials, shall show all sides of the proposed building, and shall be filed with the site plan.

9. Light spill shall be contained on the Premises. Outdoor light sources shall be aimed or shielded so that they are not visible when viewed from off the Premises, and so that light spill is cast only downward onto the Premises. Exempt from this requirement are low-wattage or low-voltage lights that are located near the principal entrance to a building, and low-wattage or low-voltage lights, not higher than 42 inches above grade, that define a walkway or other access to a building. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
10. Snow storage areas shall be identified on the site plan and landscape plan.
11. The locations of the designated fire lanes shall be shown on the Site Plan.
12. The locations of all exterior doors shall be shown on the plan. All exterior doors shall be connected by a sidewalk to an acceptable fire safety zone.
13. Permanently mounted "No Parking – Fire Lane" signs shall be posted along the fire lanes at intervals of 50 feet or less. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
14. No building permits shall be issued unless and until the Applicant executes an agreement for maintenance of the proposed storm water management facilities. Such agreement shall be subject to approval by the Planning Board's Attorney and the Commissioner of Public Works.
15. 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.
16. No building permits shall be issued unless and until the appropriate easement documents, including all necessary map references, have been filed in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk.
17. No pre-construction 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.

18. No building permits shall be issued unless and until a digital copy of the plans has been submitted. All sheets in the drawing set, with all necessary signatures, shall be provided in Tagged Image File (".TIF") format at a minimum resolution of 400 dpi.
19. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Commissioner of Public Works, and Engineering staff.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

20. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
21. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include agents, designees, and successors.
22. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.
23. The timber guiderail north of the parking lot shall be modified to provide screening of headlights and provide a safety barrier in accordance with the New York State Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code and as discussed this evening, subject to final approval by the Planning Board Clerk.
24. Building architecture shall be modified to incorporate false windows and other architectural details, as discussed this evening, so that all four sides are more consistent with each other in their appearance, subject to final approval by the Planning Board Clerk.
25. The Applicant has proposed a low masonry wall along the West Ridge Road frontage as mitigation for visual impacts associated with the drive thru operation. Said wall would require a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals and would need to be approved separately from this application. The Planning Board supports the granting of such a variance by the Board of Zoning Appeals. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, the Applicant shall apply to the Board of Zoning Appeals for a variance to install the masonry wall as described this evening, and if such variance is granted, shall seek a waiver of the Minor Improvement Plan approval requirement pursuant to Town of Greece Code, Section 211-60(D)(7), for installation of the masonry wall.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Burke	Yes
	Geisler	Yes	Slocum	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Absent
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 17, 2017

SPECIAL PLANNING TOPICS

Old Business

None

New Business

None

CODE ENFORCEMENT

ADJOURNMENT: 9:15 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: _____