

A regular meeting of the Town of Victor Planning Board was held on Tuesday, February 26, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. at the Victor Town Hall at 85 East Main Street, Victor, New York, with the following members present:

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

OTHERS: Wes Pettee, Town Engineer Consultant; Kim Kinsella, Project Coordinator; Dave Condon, Town Board Liaison; Fred Salsburg; Nancy Shelton; Donna Morley; Mark Tayrien; Wayne Minng; Nan Hooker; Tom Hooker; Marsha Senges; Cheryl Olson; Debby Trilluad; Sue Davie; Andrew Phillips; Robert Schlueten; David Nankin; Ed Wilson; Lee Wagan; Bob Housel; Jaime Westfall; Edwin Rueda; James Cretekos; Fred Rainaldi; Mathew Lingam; Lisa Boughton, Secretary;

The meeting was opened, the Flag was saluted, and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chairman Santoro made the announcements regarding emergency exits; restrooms; attendance sheet; business cards; resolutions and agenda; conversations and cell phones.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 12, 2019

On motion of Al Gallina, seconded by Rich Seiter,

RESOLVED that the minutes of February 12, 2019 be approved.

Ernie Santoro	Aye
Joe Logan	Aye
Heather Zollo	Abstained
Al Gallina	Aye
Rich Seiter	Aye

Approved 4 Ayes, 0 Nays

BOARDS AND COMMITTEE UPDATES

Town Board reported by Dave Condon

Mr. Condon – We saw the same presentation last night from Mark on the Incentive Zoning and Sewer. I think the other things that we are working on pretty extensively are Access Management, which has come along pretty nicely. A public service announcement that the public can help spread the word is that Assessment notices are coming out. We are going to be seeing some increases in those areas in the Town of Victor, *inaudible*. There were some folks here last night who would like to have sewers thru ought the entire town.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

WALMART REMODEL

2-SP-2019

441 Commerce Drive

Zoned - Commercial

Owner – Main Street Stop LLC

Applicant would like to re-paint the exterior of the store to a neutral color scheme with orange & blue accent colors and to add a "Pickup" sign to identify a new service. Also requested is the expansion/addition to the bale & recycling enclosure.

Mr. Ed Wilson Representing Walmart addressed the Board.

Good Evening, My name is Ed Wilson. Walmart is performing a remodel for their store coming up here later this year. There are 3 items that they would like to propose that they need to get approval on. The first one is they would like to paint all the paintable surfaces and refresh them all to neutral grays. That would be all the paintable surfaces, we wouldn't paint anything that is not already painted. The exceptions to the neutral colors would be that they want to paint blue behind the main logo sign on the front of the building and they would also like to paint a little bit of orange and behind what I will be talking about later, is behind a pick up sign. It is for their new pick-up program that I am sure you have heard about. Sort of a *way finding* mechanism that they have got.

The next thing they are looking at is the signage. There are currently two Walmart logo signs on the building, and they would like to swap those out like for like. Newer, fresher signs with the same look and then they would also like to add, again what I referred to before, the pick-up way finding area above the orange. We would like to propose a sign that says pick up there to indicate to people where they need to go. Lastly on the list they are looking to, at the rear of the store, there is currently a bale and pallet storage area there. They would like to expand that to include a recycling area. They do take some recycling there but are having some trouble keeping it clean and neat around the area. They would like to build a new area there and just add onto the current facility to house the recycling and hopefully keep it out of the parking lot itself. Those are the items they have to deal with.

Chairman Santoro – Being a public hearing is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak or have a comment or question? Being none we will go to the board.

Mrs. Zollo – Yes, I would like to concur with our architectural consultant who said that we do not want to add colors to the building that just call attention to themselves, by the color alone and that the existing natural tone colors are more consistent with the standard. When this plaza was originally approved the Planning Board had Walmart agree to not go with their standard box store colors and signage. I would like you to definitely adhere to the architectural consultant's comments and stay away from the blue and the orange. Do you have any diagrams of what the pallet extensions area is going to look like?

Mr. Wilson – We haven't designed it yet but what they are wanting to do is to put a chain linked area around, just about a 15 x 10 foot area about 10 feet high.

Mr. Logan – I agree with Heather about the colors. I was on the Board at that time when the approvals were made and the colors definitely do not fit the façade architecture there. The dumpster enclosures and other enclosure perimeter of the outside should look like what they do now so just a chain link fence, in my opinion, does not meet that. I would extend the wall around to enclose it on the two sides where you are adding the chain link. The gate, of course, the chain link works with the slats in the front if that's what you are doing so that it would match that architecture. So you are going to end up with a center wall that's more substantial then you would have if you had designed it this way the first time but the perimeter should still be the concrete and brick look.

Mr. Wilson – So in terms of the concept of being able to build a recycling enclosure to extend that, you have no problem with that, you're asking for it to be the same material as out there now?

Mr. Logan – It is a good idea, obviously you want to contain the materials that you're generating.

Mr. Gallina - I have nothing beyond what Heather and Joe have already said.

Mr. Chairman – We will keep the public hearing open. You have heard the comments and you will have to address them.

Mr. Wilson – We understand about the colors. The one question I would have regarding that is, if you go there, there is one store called FIVE BELOW that has blue behind their logo sign that is very similar to what we are wanting to put up there. There is also another store called ULTA Beauty, I believe is what it is called, that has orange awnings that are also very similar to what we have got. Would that be something to consider?

Mr. Chairman – I think they are probably considerably smaller than what you have in mind.

Mr. Wilson – They are smaller. What we are talking about, for example the blue just above the entry, we are not talking about painting it across the whole building.

Mrs. Zollo – I think the ULTA's orange is a little bit more subtle than what you have depicted here.

Mr. Chairman – You will need to revise them and come back.

Mr. Wilson – I will need to check with Walmart to see if they would like to do that. What would be an acceptable color to paint those? Would the gray... am I understanding correctly that the grays we are proposing are okay?

Mr. Logan – I have no issues with gray as long as the whole thing is not gray. If it looks like brick it should stay like brick.

Mr. Wilson – We are not painting anything that is not already painted.

Mr. Logan – I would suggest putting the darker color that you were proposing to put on there, it looks like you are freshening up paint on other areas that look kind of brownish not just gray tones. Is that right?

Mr. Wilson – There is 3 different shades of gray on there. Anything that you see up there (points to screen image) that is brown or reddish is the brick. It's natural.

Mr. Logan – If you had a darker version of what is behind the Walmart sign now that would match the darker versions of the building that would be good. Or something complimentary to the grays and the brick colors, I don't think the Board would have a problem with that.

Mrs. Zollo – Are you talking about a darker gray, Joe, behind the Walmart sign?

Mr. Logan – Yes, right now the Walmart sign is kind of tan, orangey tan almost. You want to repaint that, I get that. I would make that a little darker shade or maybe a color that complimented the reds in the brick tone areas versus having a large patch of gray. That is my personal opinion. If it was a darker gray that you guys felt would be better than that then I could probably live with that.

Mr. Wilson – I can bring that back to Walmart and see what they say.

Mr. Logan – It is something that you want to make the sign stand out obviously. Darker color to me for white text would make sense.

Mr. Wilson – I think typically white for signage other than their Walmart sign...most of their stores have more signage than this one does. For those white color signs they do usually use the darker gray behind there. I can bring that back to them and see what they want to do.

Mr. Logan – It is the intense colors that would take away from the rest of the architecture of that building that which we have had to work hard at to tone it down and break up the façade, and everything else that I am sure you are aware of.

Mr. Chairman – That is it for tonight.

Mr. Wilson – Thank you.

BANK OF AMERICA ATM
7651 State Route 96 (Panera Bread)
Owner – West Hollow LLC

5-SP-2019
Zoned - Commercial

Applicant is requesting approval for a drive-up ATM kiosk with a bypass lane with signs, clearance bar and site lighting.

Matt Lingam with Stonefield Engineering representing Bank of America for the ATM at 7651 Pittsford Victor Road addressed the Board.

Mr. Lingam – We are proposing an ATM along the south side of the property. The property is located within the commercial district and we are proposing one drive up ATM within the setbacks. It has a drive up lane as well as a bypass lane associated. The project will propose 6 area lights, 3 of the area lights will be mounted at the height of 25 feet and the 2 area lights adjacent to the ATM will be mounted at 10 feet to help with the security lighting for the NYS code. The lighting design was created to comply within NYS regulations and we understand there were some variances created within the Town of Victors ordinance and we are looking to discuss with both Boards the impacts and what we can do to help mitigate the maximum illumination on the property. On the site plan you can see that we have a bypass lane on page C3 of the site plan.

Mr. Logan – You may need to use the portable mic so everyone can hear you.

Mr. Lingam – On sheet C3 you can see our ATM is located within the setbacks and has a queuing lane of approximately four vehicles. We propose a bypass lane adjacent to the drive thru ATM lane in case a customer enters the bank ATM area and decides that they are in a rush or emergency occurs that they have an extra lane to get around the vehicles that are queued at the ATM. Another reason is it provides an emergency vehicle access to access the ATM if something happens and a vehicle is parked there for any emergency purposes. We are increasing impervious coverage on site.

We received the County comment letters as well as the one from LaBella and the one from the town. We are taking into consideration the increase in impervious coverage and looking to work with the town to determine the best solution. If it is to remove the bypass lane and keep the impervious coverage as is as well as the gravel strip that is there currently, which we understand is for the pre-treatment of the infiltration on site, then we are definitely looking to work with you on that as well.

Mr. Chairman—Wes, do you have a comment about the lighting? You had submitted a report.

Mr. Pettee — In our letter we followed up with the Town Code Enforcement Officers concerns with lighting. We recognized that the proposed lightening there is quite a bit more intense than what the towns regulations would typically allow. There is a provision of the Town Code that says, I think I mentioned it here, *except as described below all outdoor lightening installed after the effective date of this Chapter*; meaning Chapter 131 *the lightening code, should comply with*

these requirements. This includes but is not limited too; new lighting, replacement lighting or any other lighting, whether attached to structures, poles, earth or any other location including lighting installed by any third party. This Chapter shall not apply to the following, and one of the sub paragraphs was ATM lighting, such as lighting as regulated by the ATM Safety Act. I am not exactly sure right off the top of my head what the minimum illumination is that would be allowable for an ATM. I think there can be some dialog between the applicant and the Town's Code Enforcement Officer about the lighting intensity because it appears your plan shows that you're exceeding the minimum requirements for the ATM Safety Act.

Mr. Lingam – There is the NYS Code for exterior ATMs has a few regulations. I can go thru them if you like. There is a five foot radius from the ATM that you have to meet at minimum of 10 foot candles, five feet above grade. There is at grade 30 foot radius from the ATM, at grade you have to meet 2 foot candles at 3 feet above grade. At the 50 foot radius you have to meet 1 foot candle and it's normal to a light source. So essentially, the light meter would be shined directly to the closest light source and it has to be one foot candle. There is 60 foot radius at five feet above grade that has to hit a minimum of two foot candles as well. In our design of the ATM we did design it to hit those regulations. On sheet C7, I am showing the overall page right now (points to mounted plans) this just shows the ISO lines that were incorporated by the town to show the 20 foot, I think 15, ten, two and one and half foot candles. So we showed all those on our overall site plan to show the spillage over the property line.

We also have the requirements for the state as well as the bank standards for illumination. The main area of brightness for the ATM is associated with the three ATM canopy lights that are underneath ATM canopy. Those are the standard that come with the ATM. They are GE LED lighting fixtures that are recessed within the canopy. They just provide the minimum safety for anyone operating the ATM. The two lights along the property line have back light shields on them so they prevent as much spillage as possible over the property line in that area. The two area lights on the parking island in the middle that separate the parking from the ATM are going to be double 180 area lights. It will illuminate the radius appropriately. We do meet the maximum mounting height of 25 feet for all our lights and we do exceed the illumination over property line mainly on the western side of the property.

We can definitely work with the Town on avoiding the need for a fence. Fences are bulky and bring a little aesthetic displeasure to a site. We would prefer to do lighting fixtures but if we were to do a fence behind the ATM it would eliminate the need to illuminate behind the ATM within the landscaping area. We can terminate our illumination requirements at the fence line but then the minimum fence height requirement would have to be 6 feet for that to take effect.

Mr. Logan – What would the limits on the fence be? Is it the length of the drive and do you have to wrap it around?

Mr. Lingam – It would have to extend the full 60 foot radius. It would be 30 feet both ways of the ATM to eliminate the need for any illumination requirements behind the fence.

Chairman Santoro – Any from the public have any comment or questions on this application? Hearing none I will go back to the Board.

Mr. Logan – I was noting you were adding two light fixtures and replacing one on the median between your ATM and the parking next to Panera.

Mr. Lingam – There is an existing light there today that faces the Panera parking area. We just propose to remove it to eliminate the need for more light fixtures. The reason we didn't upgrade that or change that light fixture is because it wouldn't have worked with the illumination requirements needed for the site. The bank likes to have control of the light fixtures because they do need to be on from dusk till dawn and the bank needs to ensure that they are kept on during those hours to ensure the customers safety.

Chairman Santoro – Photo cells, are they timers?

Mr. Lingam – They are photo cells so they have solar panels in it that they read if any light illuminate from the sun and if it becomes nighttime they will turn on automatically. The LED's are recessed within the light fixtures so there is no direct light source that you can see. They are full cut off recessed. The value of the bug is zero. We had not provided that so we can definitely add that to the site plans just so you have that for your references as well.

Mr. Logan – As far as adding the extra lane, I am for that. Honestly, if it can work for drainage, Wes I don't know if you had any comments, the impervious surface they are adding for the extra lane, does that still work with the drainage?

Mr. Pettee – So that was a comment that Mary Steblein made in our office, our Stormwater Engineer. Maybe there could be some dialogue between the applicant and Mary in terms of if we want to keep the impervious area the same. One of the questions was is the three by three foot area, lack of a better term riprap on the...

Mr. Lingam –The crushed mat at the top of the sight?

Mr. Pettee – Yes it is the mat.

Mr. Lingam – That was just to help to direct the stormwater within the same flow that is existing today. Now we understand that the gravel mat initially along that side of the drive thru existing today was for pre-treatment purposes. We hadn't understood that previously and we understand that now. One of the main reasons we curb the whole side of the drive thru is because the foundation of the ATM has to be raised four inches for it to meet minimum reach height within a vehicle. One of the things we can work with her on is to provide that foundation of four inches at the ATM and taper back down to asphalt so that the drainage stays the same and then we can replace the pre-treatment of gravel back to its original condition. We can work with the Town on that as well.

Mr. Pettee – That is good. It sounds like now that the comment is out you have come to realize the purpose of the pre-treatment there.

Mr. Lingam – It would look a little interesting because it would have a five foot curb taper that comes up to the point and goes back down at the other side. Aesthetically it may look a little

weird but it would meet drainage standards. We understand the purpose of that and we can defiantly put it back as needed.

Mr. Logan – Is that because you are proposing an actual raised curb thru the whole length of it?

Mr. Lingam – The whole curb is four inches high and we thought it evenly thru out the whole drive thru lane would look the best and also to keep the drainage along the curb line and would go towards that stone mat. The stone mat was to help preserve the grass in that area so that there is not too much water and it slows it down and lets it disperse a little more evenly rather than just straight onto grass.

Mr. Logan – In many of these malls where you have such vast areas of impervious they have curbs with cut outs all the way around. I don't know if that would help define your curb line better than tapering it off and then to have people maybe drive on the grass.

Mr. Lingam – We could definitely go into that as well and consider a few curb cuts within the curb about every 25 feet so that water can exit in that area.

Chairman Santoro – So that everyone is aware that when Panera approval went thru this was on the plan. This was not unknown.

Mr. Gallina – I agree. I think the bypass lane adds some good functionality. As far as the lighting goes certainly want to meet the state requirements but not exceed them so whatever you can do to make sure we are at that level and no more.

Mr. Lingam – We can do a little more research. The bank likes to meet both standards and try to comply with the NYS standards as well not proposing too many light fixtures on site. One of the ideas is you can propose more light fixtures for this site at a lower LED. It is more light fixtures in this small area would almost bring too much attention to the site. You do not want 12 light poles within a 60 foot radius area. It is an option that we can go thru if you do want that option of more light poles less illumination.

Chairman Santoro – We have heard this before.

Mr. Logan – Don't these LED lights have a lot of little sources that you can put more or fewer of the actual points? Can you cut down on the number of those and focus them in the right direction? You can aim them in different directions.

Mr. Lingam – We do propose the four M fixtures which throw far out as well as wide. There are 2m's that throw further wide rather than out and there are five still around. We could experiment with a few of those. We typical stay with the 4m's because they do eliminate spillage behind and we are trying to avoid spillage behind the ATM. Especially at a 25 foot mounting height we want to eliminate that as much as possible.

Mr. Gallina – When we were talking about the potential of a fence, my preference would be not to see a fence as a way to fill the spillage.

Mr. Lingam – A fence on this property would bring the aesthetics down.

Mrs. Zollo – Is the Code Enforcement Officer and the County wrong when they are saying that you are exceeding the NY Banking Lighting Code?

Mr. Lingam – There are areas where we do exceed the NYS Lighting Code but if you look at the limit of where the radii are of each standard we are hitting the minimum of where that is. We are .04-.03 foot candles above those minimums at the extent of the radii. On the NY lightening requirements table you can see what the minimum is within that radii so that is what we are showing and representing. That is what has to be above the minimum. It is not the average of the minimum and there are areas of this radii that are high and that is to account for the throw of the light fixture hitting the extent of the radius.

Mrs. Zollo – I would agree with Joe and Al that we want to keep it at the bare minimum and not exceed any of these lighting requirements. You are up on a hill and all the additional lighting when it is elevated does affects the driving on Route 96 and shines right in the face of the drivers. Have you taken that into consideration that you are already elevated?

Mr. Lingam – Yes, we definitely took that into consideration and try to eliminate that spillage over that eastern side of the property as much as possible because that is Route 96. The majority of our illumination over the property line which exceeds the maximum is on the western side which is the driveway into the Panera. We tried to eliminate as much spillage onto Route 96 as possible as shown in the overall lighting plan. We did take that into consideration that there will be a lot of traffic going thru there so we tried to eliminate that problem.

Mrs. Zollo – Adding the additional lane we are still meeting the green space requirement?

Mr. Lingam – We are still meeting the green space requirement as shown on the site plans. The required open space for the Town is 35% and we are still at 45% of open space. We did see in one of the comment letters that we are proposing to remove four total trees. The reason we are moving the trees is because they are within the illumination radius and any obstruction over three feet within illumination radius will count as a noncompliance for the requirement. We can work with the Town to relocate those three trees outside of the 60 foot ATM radius and place them somewhere else on site and that they are there for purpose of the site.

Mrs. Zollo – That would be great. Thank you.

Mr. Gallina – As the vehicles exit either lane making that right turn they are rolling around park cars and looks like a planting on the end. Oncoming traffic into the parking lot which may or may not be looking in that direction, that looks like a trouble spot. Is there a possible speed bump per se before the stop sign, something to make people slow down and pay attention as they are putting away their ATM cards?

Mr. Lingam – We were hoping the stop sign would ideally stop the vehicles. People are going to roll thru the stop sign.

Mr. Gallina – I have seen many that do not. They are putting their card back in their pocket and not paying attention and are not seen by people coming on.

Mr. Lingam – We can put a speed bump or some other.

Mr. Gallina - Maybe some other planting down or flashing light. Something that attracts people's attention one way or another.

Mr. Lingam – What about those stop signs that flash?

Mr. Gallina – I do not know what the answer is but it is just a question.

Mr. Lingam – We do propose a stop bar as well as two stop signs on both sides of the egress driveway hoping that the pedestrians will utilize it. Obviously, there will be the certain cases where there is going to be a customer that is fiddling with his phone or going thru the stop sign at a roll. We do think that we provide the minimum at least, requirements for stopping. We can look at flashing stop signs or something to get more attention towards that egress. I did drive thru the site today so I understand that is where the main entrance of the Panera is coming from that light on 96 it does make sense.

Chairman Santoro – I don't think that a flashing light is a solution.

Mr. Lingam – A flashing light would be interesting.

Mr. Gallina – It might attract people's attention who aren't paying attention. Whether it is the people exiting the ATM or the people coming in from the parking lot the other direction.

Mr. Chairman Santoro – I assume it will be available 24 hours a day. Does Panera have an ATM inside?

Mr. Lingam – I don't believe I have ever seen one in there.

Mr. Logan – I have never seen one in there.

Mr. Lingam – They have those manual machines but I do not think they have an ATM.

Mr. Logan – I would have a problem putting a speed bump in that area with snowplowing and things like that in the winter time. A lot of people look at that as a way a way to calm traffic but like you said there is a stop sign and stop bar. If people can't see that and stop you cannot legislate against stupidity, sorry, you can only do so much and make it functional. That is my opinion on the record apparently.

Mr. Chairman Santoro – We look forward to your next presentation.

Mr. Lingam – Thank you very much!

Mr. Chairman Santoro – The next two have been withdrawn. Papke House and Patriot Towers also known as Pinnacle Towers.

LEAD AGENCY COORDINATION

WOODS AT VALENTOWN – Lead Agency Coordination

High Point Drive

Appl No 35-SP-18

Owner – Woods at Valentown, LLC

Acreage – 56.87

Zoned – Planned Development District

Applicant is requesting approval to construct 288 for rent apartments within 12 buildings on 56.87 acres. The project will consist of underground parking and the buildings will be 3 stories for a maximum height of 48 ft. This is the first step in the process, requesting the Planning Board be Lead Agency.

Mr. Cretekos from BME Associates and Fred Rainaldi, applicant addressed the Board.

Mr. Cretekos – I wanted to give you a very brief update of what has occurred since the last time we were at the Board and the two meetings we held with different agencies. The first was with the Water Authority last week and we worked thru a couple options with them. We are currently doing a cost analysis on the most effective way to improve the water system out here to make sure we are meeting all the fire departments flows and required sprinkler demands. The other meeting we did have was with Victor Trails. We met with them as well as the Genesee Valley Off-Road Cyclist Club regarding the development of some trails on there. We had a good two hour meeting and reviewed different locations on the sites for trails. We are basically going to be coordinating a field walk with them. We are going to do some preliminary investigation of different types of trails. We discussed doing some more bike trails and off road trails in the steeper areas as well as some passive areas, potentially like a wetland viewing station. Similar to something that they have down in the Village of Fairport. Some different ways and methods to interconnect the different areas of the site as well with some of the other trail networks on the surrounding properties. We have been in coordination with both Kim (Kinsella) and Wes on SEQR component of this and have been working with them over the last couple weeks to try and develop a strategy to help guide us thru the process. We are here to answer any questions that you guys have but would like to turn it over to Wes to get us started on that process. Unless there are any other comments from the public.

Chairman Santoro – The public hearing is still open. Any comments from the public?

Mr. Rueda – I am the adjoining neighbor to the project. I had a couple of concerns. Last time the Board got together I wasn't here and was down South Carolina preparing for a wedding for

my son. I am not sure if the lighting issue was brought up or was addressed regarding the actual road that would lead up.

Chairman Santoro - The building lighting was discussed.

Mr. Rueda – There was also the concern of the lighting on the road. I also had another comment regarding one of the walls; there are two retaining walls and a third that actually isn't shown. The cars would actually park and the lights would be reflecting towards my property.

Chairman Santoro – Mr. Reyes brought that up last time and there was a response. One of them they could not do a wall.

Mr. Cretkos – The two locations that we were talking about where this retaining wall is here between the buildings.

Mr. Rueda – My concern is this wall here (points to site plan).

Mr. Cretkos – The rationale the Board had last time was that these headlights are not directed at your property, they will be over to the (*inaudible*) which is obviously up on the hill. Regarding some of the lighting on the roadway again this is pretty well depressed from the property. We can take a look at the top of the pole heights.

Mr. Rueda – So you are saying that if a vehicle turns into this area that it would always come from this angle and that would be my concern. Would placing a wall here right here (points to plan).....

Mr. Cretkos – There is a bio retention area in this facility and this was what was discussed. Basically, we are treating the pavement with a water quality practice so we do not want to put up any hard wall barrier to basically prevent the run off from getting into that. We can look at planting some more Evergreens along this tree line similar to what we are doing here. Too basically to reaffirm that area.

Mr. Rueda – I am not sure you understand my point. Obviously, a vehicle would come from this angle. This looks like this is miles away but it is really not. When you do not have any foliage you get it directly.

Chairman Santoro – He just mentioned that they could look into that. Less likely a car is going to be coming from that direction.

Mr. Rainaldi – In addition to the White Firs that we updated on the landscape plan for the Evergreens, pursuant to our last meeting. One thing I will discuss with James and team even though this is a critical bio-retention area there are some natural styled berms that we can pepper thru there to accomplish the same. It would be a rhythm of the natural berms and filtration system and the gap would be filled in with those Evergreens. It would be a combination of the two so we don't impose on the functionality of that bio-retention area but we will get it thru the

berm. Your concern is that if someone were to park going this way? We can enhance the arc so that the arc is this. We can design that so it captures that arc.

Mr. Rueda – So by placing these trees?

Mr. Rainaldi – And berms. It creates a wall. A natural wall.

Mr. Cretekos – The berm we wouldn't be creating. It would be right on the edge of the parking. We can do something closer to the actual tree line.

Mr. Rueda – It would be easier to do that than actually place any wall?

Mr. Rainaldi – This bio-retention area in particular was so highly designed to service this layout which remember the layout was modified very specifically to provide as much protection as possible to your property. To all of your property. We flipped the drive outs, we have done the lighting study, you were not here Heather and I want to show you the sconces that were chosen. Instead of putting a hard walled wall or stone, I prefer a rhythm of Evergreens and berm. That way this looks more natural and then we do the angles and (*inaudible*) BME will place these specifically to service your concern. I see what you're saying. This is a really easy study to be able to capture 100% of this. Essentially I am going to do an arc, 180 degree arc. Regardless of how they are entering those stalls, I am going to create a more beautiful natural environment that is not going disturb the design of the bio-retention system.

Mr. Rueda – Surrounding the property I guess you're going to be replacing some sort of greenery. Did you mention placing it?

Mr. Rainaldi – Yes Evergreens.

Mr. Cretekos – There are Evergreens here right now for the bio-retention area and some roadside planting. Obviously, based on elevation this is still well below your property until you're almost up at this point. (*inaudible*)

Mr. Rueda – Are there actual light poles on the actual road? I don't know much about the illumination but it would be great if there is no spillage. That one time when we had the issue with the parking lot off to the right hand side your dad said he would turn down the lights and that worked. The lights will be coming back?

Mr. Rainaldi – We have greater access to technology. We have a greater control of these access roads and are just that, they are access roads. The amount of light will meet the minimums for safety and we have also agreed per comments at the last meeting to use the shorter poles. I testified also we have updated any landscaping to be used as buffer per your attorney request at the last meeting which will be a White Fir or similar. It will be a mature caliper. I will not put a seedling there that will take a decade and a half.

Mr. Rueda – He did mention something regarding you guys actually having me place or paying for these Firs?

Mr. Rainaldi – No, I said we could talk.

Mr. Rueda – I am not interested in doing any landscaping or anything.

Mr. Rainaldi – We would just include you in the process. We do site walks and the process is the Town inspects every part of this process. I don't leave here and "Ok go do your thing" they inspect this. If we were doing the site walk and we said this is where we are going to place the White Firs, I can call you and you can come out and we can actually mark the location.

Mr. Rueda – You're really going to call me?

Mr. Rainaldi - One hundred percent. I am committing to it.

Chairman Santoro – You weren't here last time but they had a balloon study. Have you seen this?

Mr. Rueda – I know the attorney has some paperwork. Since I have gotten back, I have hit the ground running and haven't had time. He just got in from Buffalo so we have both been busy.

Mr. Rainaldi – We have been translating all these to digital and sending them to the attorneys as well. Everything you see. It's just easier.

Chairman Santoro – He has your number. He will call you. Anyone else have a comment?

Mrs. Zollo – Fred you said that you had some lighting info to share with me?

Mr. Rainaldi – For any lighting required by Code or light safety is if there is an exit light or something that has to be imposed over an exit what I agreed to do is to paint that fixture the same color as the building. It will disappear with the façade. All of the decorative lighting, the inset sconces in the balconies, those are the specific units the cut sheets are included. That is essentially what you would be staring at.

Mrs. Zollo – That is the building rendering?

Mr. Rainaldi – The cool thing about our technology that is the exact CAD file brought into 3-D. At some point when we have the full model built, I will be able to present a virtual tour. I can actually mirror it to these and we can walk around and see. It is how I introduce spaces to tenants that aren't local. So we've been building these interior and just created the framework to the outside as well.

Mr. Logan – Fred is that the same thing you showed me? You can look around with the phone.

Mr. Rainaldi – The neat thing about doing that is what these companies are doing now from lighting manufactures to interface flooring. You can buy the spec model and can actually adopt it into your CAD system. If you think about the importance or sensitivities around introducing

an apartment product where it's very intimate. We can actually show the exact materials. You ever see the commercials where the people are building their sofas...it is like that with a little greater specificity.

Mr. Logan – Heather if you were looking at this thing you could not tell that the building is not built. It looks like it has already been constructed.

Mrs. Zollo – Anything like that, that would give us a better idea. All we ever get is this two dimensional and it is very difficult to really visualize how close these buildings are together, how they are going to impact the adjacent properties when you just see a two dimensional rendering. If we could get a three dimensional rendering or some virtual way to actually see what it is going to look like when it's built that would be excellent.

Mr. Rainaldi – We do go to great lengths to apply the highest level of technology to our rendering. All the renderings I bring in have that amount of thought put into them. They are not artistic illustrations they are to scale and represent actual materials that we spec. Unless they are directed by cause, for instance, the lightening schematic we impose as much information as possible to help guide the decision making. As important as it is to you to understand it, it is also important for me to understand it because there are major applications and the execution and making sure that we are building the best possible so we all benefit.

Mr. Pettee – We have to talk about SEQR a little bit. The State Environmental Quality Review Act. Before the Planning Board can take action on the site plan, whether the Planning Board chooses to approve, approve with conditions or deny the site plan application, the Planning Board needs to conduct SEQR. The applicant provided a Long Environment Assessment Form Part I and I have drafted a Part II that I want to go over tonight in preparation for a determination of significance at some point. The SEQR is going to look at the environmental impacts of this project and help you move the project forward. Part II of the EAF is the responsibility of the lead agency, in this case I think it was the last Planning Board meeting, the Board declared itself lead agent and Part II is designed to help the lead agency inventory all potential resources that could be effective by a proposed project or action and we recognize that the lead agencies reviewers will not necessarily be environmental professionals. The questions are designed to walk thru a reviewer thru an assessment process by providing it a series of questions that can be answered using the information found in Part I of the EAF that the applicant provided to us. Then to further assist the lead agency in completing Part II the form identifies most relevant questions in Part I that will provide the information needed to answer the Part II questions. When Part II is completed the lead agency will have identified the relevant environmental areas that may be impacted by the proposed activity.

I thought I would also offer the design engineer and the applicant a copy of the Part II that we are going to review here tonight. (*Hands out form to applicant*) We need to take a hard look at the project and some of these questions thru the environmental assessment workbook with you. It is on the DEC website. Back in 2017, when the project was before the Planning Board for recommendation to the Town Board on the rezoning we had started the Part II EAF. Some of these answers on what I have just handed out mimic how the responses were perceived back in 2017. There also has been a few changes to Part I of the EAF. Applicant's design engineer put together a small table that I wanted to provide for you that shows the difference

between the project as it was proposed in 2017 versus what is proposed today and what is reflected in today's Part I EAF.

Mrs. Zollo – Do you mean when it was 72 townhomes or when he first came with the 288?

Mr. Pettee – I think it was 294 units.

Mr. Cretekos – Yes it was 294 units when we made our initial submission to the Town Board. It reflected the apartments before we moved the buildings and some of the other changes that we worked thru with you guys when we were here.

Mr. Pettee – Why don't we just dive right in here to question one the impact on land. Proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of, the land surface of the proposed site. We have checked here "Yes" and there are two items where we felt initially there may be a moderate to large impact might occur. First one is B) the proposed action may involve construction on slopes of 15% or greater. I did have a chance to talk with James Cretekos earlier today about how that may have changed since 2017 and if you would not mind offering a little bit insight.

Mr. Logan – I have a question for Wes. Is this a change from the initially approved project back when it was first approved with townhouse rather than apartments? Right now we have an approved project for 3 buildings 100, 200, 300 plus 78 townhomes. Is this document a change from that or from if there is nothing built there yet?

Mr. Pettee – This Part II EAF characterizes or would help you characterize the impacts of the projects in front of you today. It is not taking into consideration so much what was expected as a result of the 2005 approval in 2005 SEQR finding statement.

Mr. Logan – Everything that has been done to date out there, there has been incredible amount of landform changes and roads that network, is this from that point moving forward? Does it include the construction of the road that has already been built? We have reviewed all the landform changes if the project were built the way it was approved in 2005 and we have dealt with all that but there is new spaces. First of all, the 3 buildings towards Mr. Rueda's property and I think it has been redone in the other areas where the four or five building are in the parcel beyond the power lines as well. I am trying to make sure I understand what is large to moderate large versus from now. If I want there out now and didn't touch this for 20 years it would be all rolling hills and all of a sudden we say, what we are going to do to it and to put all this on there, which is what you are saying.

Mr. Pettee agreed

Mr. Rainaldi – To clarify. This Part II that's being discussed we compared the 2005 versus that 294 unit proposal. This is now measuring the delta between showing any improvements from what was originally proposed with the 294 units. Still using as the baseline the 2005 SEQR. The baseline that caused that original Part II to be drafted was the delta between the 2005 SEQR and the 2017 SEQR. This exercise is to show any movement with the refined plan. The

reason that James had produces that schedule showing the differences was to show that we have actually made great gains thru the review process.

Mr. Logan – We never approved the 2017 project, right?

Mr. Pettee – The Planning Board provided a recommendation and that was on the rezoning application. The town Board did their own SEQR review of the zoning and issued a negative declaration on the rezoning application. In 2017 you didn't approve anything but I think it was in March of 2018 was when this board provided its recommendation to the Town Board.

Mr. Gallina – As part of that recommendation process did we complete Part II?

Mr. Pettee – We had begun completing Part II. Then it was suggested by the town's attorney that actually for the rezoning portion of the project the Town Board needs to be the Lead Agency.

Mr. Cretkos – The meeting minutes do state that you did complete a Part II as a review of the environmental impacts. When we originally submitted the application to the Town Board we had intended to do SEQR analyzing all of the impacts. So the EAF that you guys reviewed at that time included the impacts as we were going to do a full build out of that construction. The EAF that got submitted this last December is what is currently in front of you compared to the land that it is today. The schedule that I have prepared is comparing the EAF from 2017 submission to the EAF that we submitted today. We are taking a little bit of a step back from the 2005 review since this is more current with the different layout there are some different impacts. When we went thru the rezoning with the Town Board we did a little bit more extensive delta between the original and what the plan was then. The big changes now between the 2017 plan and this one is really just the items we worked thru changing with this board specifically for the areas over here, which is where we flipped the roadway so the 3 other buildings were now facing toward the property over here. Then we had two other buildings over here and obviously try to minimize impacts of this wooded area and steep slopes. That is when we went to the 30 unit buildings. We did lose a couple units with that change. We did lessen some impacts to water and sewer. With that we were able to save a lot more of the wooded area and steep slopes which we felt was a benefit. That is really what we are trying to identify now. This table is now is showing from the last time you reviewed how it has changed and how it is better off than what you looked at beginning of last year. I think the EAF Part II now is really just going to be review of the impacts as this was a new project. Which is what you are required to do under the SEQR.

Mr. Logan – This project has been rezoned and has been approved as acceptable. Is it officially ben rezoned?

Mr. Cretkos – Yes, it has been rezoned. We are comparing to the preliminary development plan that was approved by the Town Board that is the baseline for the application. The main changes being we switched around some of the buildings. Some of that was reflected in the final preliminary development plan that was approved.

Mr. Pettee – Item 1 B the proposed action may involve construction on slopes of 15% or greater and there is some guidance here in the DEC online manual. I wanted to have James take a moment to characterize the changes to construction on slopes 15% or greater.

Mr. Cretekos – Similar to what I just described once we got into the final design of this we were able to really review exactly the direct impact to slope areas on the site. The big change we did from time the preliminary development plan was approved was the elimination of these two 30 unit buildings in this area. It really allowed us to protect a lot more of this slope area without having to do extensive retaining walls. The change between the approved preliminary development plan and now is actually a benefit. We believe that although it is moderate to large it is very hilly and we have to build some pretty steep roads to get up towards the tops. We really try minimize the impacts of the slopes as we cold with the final design.

Mr. Pettee – I am just going to read a little bit her on the EAF workbook on this question. If there are no slopes greater than 15% on the parcel or no proposed activities are planned for locations on the parcel, there will be no steep slope related erosion runoff for visual impacts. For a small impact, what the DEC characterizes here is proposed projects that disturb limited areas of land having slopes greater than 15% are likely to have only a small impact and those examples would include only a small portion of the site contains slopes of 15% and building is limited. Any cut and fill need can be done without creating slopes greater than 15% with appropriate erosion control measures and visibility will not be increased due to position on a slope. For moderate to large impacts those examples are proposed projects that are much larger in scale where there are extensive areas of slopes greater than 15% that are unavoidable. Where there is a higher risk of storm water runoff and erosion impacting valley streams and water bodies. Where the project is on a site that is highly visible could have a moderate to large impact some examples include extensive excavation on steep slopes where cut and fill will leave slopes steeper than that exist now. Removal of large areas of vegetation on steep slopes from the site. Building on steep slopes next to streams or river banks with a history of unstable soils and visibility will be increased due to position on slope.

Those type of characteristics were looking for you to either to give an indication whether you feel this is a moderate to large impact or no/small impact may occur.

Board agreed to leave as moderate to large

Mr. Pettee – One E the proposed action may involve construction that continues for more than one year or in multiple phases. A small impact includes construction that occurs in multiple phases but the overall activity will not be substantially different from a single phase project an construction will continue for more than one year but activity will be intermittent. There will be spurts of activity for less than two months at a time, perhaps seasonally, for one or two years. An example of a moderate to large impact could be construction that occurs over multiple phases over many years should be considered long term.

Board agreed to leave as moderate to large

Mr. Pettee – Number two we will not go into this in to great of a detail. Impact on geologic features. A proposed action may result in the modification or destruction or inhibit access to

any unique or unusual landforms on the site such as cliffs, dunes, minerals, fossils and caves. We have indicated there is no impact there.

Impacts on surface water. Number three. The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies for example streams, rivers, ponds or lakes. We have indicated “Yes” there will be an impact in this regard. All of the sub questions we have “No” or small impact in this regard. Going back to the 2017 document that we had prepared.

Mr. Logan – Are there currently wetlands out there that we are going to impacting with excavation?

Mt. Pettee- James you may be a good person to characterize what occurred as part of wetland mitigation.

Mr. Cretkos – I believe we are still in the last year so of our monitoring but essentially when we did the original development and build of High Point Drive we preemptively did a wetland mitigation. This wetland and wooded area kind of continued thru here then into the stream that runs on the neighboring property. To get this road stub in we had to do some extensive fills in this area which was a wetland area. As part of that we created a constructive wetland here at a 2:1 ratio of what we disturbed to allow us to fill in this area. Kind of general rule of thumb is if you fill in some wetland you have to provide twice as much. Fred was willing to do that and as part of the project we did this large environmental wetland. Runoff basically comes thru a culvert now into a couple pools of water and then contributes to the streams. So it provides some pre-filtering for that. What is going to occur now with this phase is that there are no wetland impacts. Everything has been done and stabilized to date so looking at this project from scratch we do not need any wetland permits, which is one of the guiding factors in the workbook as well.

Ms. Zollo – As I recall there was a stream on this property that was a tributary to Irondequoit Creek?

Mr. Cretkos – Correct. It is the upper limits of the tributary. There is a lot of runoff from the farm fields to northeast of the site and it makes its way down into this wooded area and as that water concentrates it turns into a intermittent stream. It doesn’t flow unless there is rain but it does contribute to these wetlands and then into the stream that comes thru the neighboring property and crosses back under Valentown Road and then continues up past Valentown Plaza then over into Irondequoit Creek.

Ms. Zollo – On (I) the proposed action may affect the water quality of any water bodies within or downstream of the site of the proposed action.

Mr. Cretkos – I would argue that, that is “No”. One of the comments last time from the neighbor did request do be cognitive of the stream health. As part of the original wetland mitigation we did a stream monitoring report that started in 2006 and ran thru 2010. It encompassed the first phase of construction which included all this clearing. Basically what it did was allow us to establish a baseline from before construction activities. They measured different things like macro invertebrates so different measures of stream health for

environmental factors. That continued thru the first phases of construction and basically the report indicated that we did not have any impacts on the stream. Last time when we were here we did commit to if there is concerns down the road or something does appear to happen we would be willing to go out and take new sampling to compare it to the baseline data if there is a worry during construction.

Mr Rainaldi – If you recall Doug Eldridge was very excited. The way that system was designed it was applying that we are actually going to improve the quality of the discharge based on the 2006 baseline. I did in fact to agree to monitor that in perpetuity.

Mr. Pettee – Number four is Impact on groundwater. The proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquifer. We have indicated “No” in this regard.

Number Five is impact on flooding. The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding. We have indicated “No”

Number six is impacts on air. The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source. We have stated “No”.

Number seven is impacts on plants and animals. The proposed action may result in loss of flora or fauna. We have indicated “Yes” on this question. The sub paragraphs a thru h we have indicated all of those examples would be no or small impact may occur. I can read them aloud for publics befit.

Number eight is impact on agricultural resources. The proposed action may impact agricultural resources. We have indicated “Yes”. There is an agricultural district in Monroe County, the adjoining municipality just to the North. Which is part of the reason we have checked off yes here but we have indicated all of the other examples a thru g would be no or small impact may occur.

Number nine is impact on aesthetic resources. The land use of the proposed action are obviously different from or rare or in sharp contrast to current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource. We have checked “No”.

Number ten is impact on historic or archeological resources. The proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archeological resource. We have indicated “Yes”. All the sub paragraphs we indicated no or small impact. More recently I understand, the applicant has received a letter from the NYS Office of Parks and Recreation and Historic Preservation indicating that the project would have no impact on historic and archeologic resources. I think that is in the Towns files. We can use that letter also as an attachment to SEQR.

Chairman Santoro – Is it in there because of Valentown?

Mr. Pettee – Yes, the adjoin Valentown Museum.

Mr. Cretekos – Yes both. We are in archeological sensitive areas as well. When the project went thru in 2005 we initiated the original coordination with the NYS Office of Parks and Recreation Historic Preservation Office. That cleared all of the normal highpoint items. We did some phase II digging and found one arrowhead out on the site. The conifer village area which is now our section four. That area was not cleared with SHPO so we reinitiated for that portion of land. We were cleared and provided the correspondence to the Town Board during that

application. I did resend those to both Kim and Wes today and we would be happy to submit them formally.

Mr. Pettee- Number 11 is the impact on open space and recreation. The proposed action may result in a loss of recreation opportunities or reduction of an open space resource as designated in any adopted municipal open space plan. We have checked “No”.

Number 12 impact on critical environmental areas. The proposed action may be located within or adjacent to a critical environmental area. We have checked “No”

Number 13 impact on transportation. The proposed action may result in a change in existing transportation systems. We have checked “Yes”. I will go thru these because they are pretty brief. A) Projected traffic increase may exceed capacity of existing road network, we have indicated no or small impact may occur. B) The proposed action may result in the construction of paved parking areas of 500 or more vehicles no or small impact may occur. C) The proposed action will degrade existing transit access. No or small impact. D) The proposed action will degrade existing pedestrian or bicycle accommodations. No or small impact and actually there is incorporation of trails so that would contrary to degrading the existing pedestrian or bicycle accommodations. E) The proposed action may alter the present pattern of movement of people and goods. No or small impact may occur.

Mr. Seiter – Item A. That will be an impact to that area. I disagree that is small or no impact at that single entrance off of Valentown and then your exiting or entering from the mall which is already quite congested. I would say that is a moderate to large impact to traffic in general.

Mr. Pettee – The reason I had suggested there would be no or small impact there is some correspondence from Jennifer McNavich, the Towns traffic engineer at Clark Paterson Lee. Her comments are: We offer the following comments and observations. Our previous reviews were based on a traffic impact study dated December 22, 2017 prepared by Burkman. The traffic impact study analyzed the impacts of (One) 150,000 sq. foot office building, Building 300 and 14 apartment buildings with a total of 294 units. We previously agreed with the findings in the TIS that roadway infrastructure improvements provided as a result of the 2005 FEIS are adequate to meet the needs proposed in the High Point PDD modification. The proposed residential component is less than that which was presented in the TIS. They still agree with the findings. As a result of the 2005 findings statement there were some projects, some roadway improvements that were required. Each of those roadway improvements have been constructed. You have your traffic engineer telling you that the roadway and system can accommodate what is proposed here.

Mr. Seiter – I disagree it was 14 years ago I live in the vicinity and just driving about traffic is an issue.

Chairman Santoro – I do go along with Jennifer’s analysis. That is what we have to rely on.

Ms. Zollo – We always have to rely on them and it just surprising to the town residents that no matter how many units are proposed there is never an impact to traffic. It just boggles the mind.

Mr. Seiter – Agreed. Any individual project, this project and that project. Traffic is an issue in this area.

Chairman Santoro - If we reach a tipping point I am sure Jennifer will let us know.

Mr. Gallina – I agree with the sentiment but I also support Jennifer’s findings.

Mr. Zollo- We have too. That is what we have been told that we have to go along with our consultants. I disagree with the whole analysis that half the people are going to go left on Valentown road and the other half are going to right. I think they are all going to go right on Valentown Road. We will see.

Mr. Pettee – This is still in DRAFT form. I will not be adopted tonight. Let’s continue on. Are there any other sub questions b thru e that you wanted to discuss?

Number 14 impact on energy. The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy. We have indicated “Yes”. The one item where we consider a moderate to large impact is paragraph d. The proposed action may involve heating and/or cooling of more than 100,000 sq. feet of building area when completed. I think this is worth taking a look at the EAF workbook.

Proposed projects that include land use similar to those in surrounding area that follow the NYS Energy Code are likely to have only a small impact examples would be residential development in a already suburbanized area, small commercial uses in a professional office or industrial park and uses that are fully compliant with a communities adopted local climate action plan. A moderate to large impact; proposed projects that are much larger in scale then the surrounding land use is or that are in a remote area with limited energy infrastructure could have a moderate to large impact. Examples include an industrial use on a rural road with an electric transmission lines as designed for only scattered residential land use. A single commercial use in an industrial park with much higher energy demands than the other uses in the park. Industrial projects that require large amounts of energy during operation and large number of residential units in a rural area.

Mr. Logan – Do we have a local climate action plan in this town?

Mr. Pettee- I am not aware of one.

Mr. Logan – We have plans that impact energy usage in the town. I was wondering what a local climate action is?

Chairman Santoro – We already have some of that in place because of the office buildings. Do you say the office buildings will use more energy than these apartments?

Mr. Cretkos – Yes. Definitely. The office building will use more energy. The threshold to be moderate to large, what we typically do is once we hit that 100,000 sq. foot of building space we do usually just mark it moderate and then we typically recommend to the board is with the Part 3 with your elaborated rationale that the buildings are all going to be compliant with the energy code. The existing infrastructure is able to support the development. It’s a non-significant impact even thou it is a moderate one.

Mr. Pettee- Number 15 impact on noise order and light. The proposed action may result in an increase in noise, odors, or outdoor lighting regulation. We have indicated “Yes”. However all of these sub paragraphs we have indicated no or small impact may occur.

Chairman Santoro – You will not be doing any blasting?

James Cretkos indicated No

Mr. Logan – There was a comment on street lighting during the earlier discussion when Mr., Rueda was up there. Fred did you talk to street lights on this or maybe James can.

Mr. Cretkos – As a part of the lighting design we are obviously going to be compliant with the town code which does not allow any light spillage over property lines. All of the lighting on the roadways is all internal to the site too. Besides the existing vegetation surrounding the perimeters and in some cases the buildings themselves it will be generally be screened from really the only neighboring residentially use which is up in this corner. Everywhere else is pretty well buffered from buildings and parking areas from where the light poles on the roadways will be located.

Mr. Logan - I think you did 25 foot poles, is that correct?

Mr. Rainaldi – We have agreed to the shorter pole. The other thing we have been practicing as of recent, purely a result to greater access to light fixtures is the heads themselves. The heads on these light poles do not have to be the same heads as the ones here (*points to plans*) If I am responding to a sensitive area I can react accordingly. When I do the cut sheets that follow the plans I can show you this is what is going to be utilized on completely contained environments which will absolutely meet the code and these ones are going to be a little more aggressive to protect sensitivities. The heads now are interchangeable so if you said this is not working to plan, it is not a great effort to go thru. A lot times with these older light systems even at the mall, they change them in phases because it expensive and cumbersome. Here it is literally renting the equipment to get up there. All of them are quick ship now because of ease of access. Monroe and Ontario County have mandated incredible grains. The new Chapter 13 Building Code the energy star ratings are the highest they have ever been so even though build these per code we are using a superior product. We have the ability to react according to any concern that is unique but every one of them will be a newer version what you’re used to.

Mr. Logan – So the answer is yes. It sounds like it is a minor impact because you’re doing some mitigation in terms of the type of fixtures in directing it away from sensitive areas and properties. Letter d on number 15. It is still relatively minor. There are still one or two light poles along the drive to those three buildings.

Mr. Cretkos – There are three or four. One down by the intersection and one up here on the crest and one kind of in the middle. Spaced on opposite side of the road and alternating. They are at the angle points in the steep locations to really help draw attention grade changes, curves and things of that nature. It is really just a safety and security. We are not illuminating the whole road up so that it is not a landing strip at an airport. You can look at the lighting plan

obviously and look at the photo metrics and really see the areas that we are doing and with the updated plans we are planning to provide a point plot.

Mr. Pettee – Number 16 impact on human health. The proposed action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants. We have indicated “No”.

Number 17 is consistency with community plan. The proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans. We have indicated “Yes”. All of them are no or small impact may occur with the exception of paragraph E. The proposed action may cause a change in the density of development that is not supportably existing infrastructure or is distant from existing infrastructure. The reason why I have indicated that as moderate to large impact is because of the town sanitary sewer system. We have evaluated the Pump Station 18 which this project would send flows to. Although in 2005 a project was approved with X number of units and Pump Station 18 could accommodate them at that point in time a lot has changed since 2005. Developments contributing flows to PS 18 as well as flows to the conveyance system within the Cobblestone Golf Course area. The town is taking action to remedy this situation and the limited capacity that remains in the town’s conveyance system. PS 18 will be replaced as part of the Towns capital improvement project with sanitary sewer system and the Auburn Trail sewer. There is also a pump station within Cobblestone. Pump Station 14 has had some overflow events in the recent past and that PS has been proposed to be replaced as well.

Mr. Logan – Does this feed 14? Does 18 feed into 14?

Mr. Pettee – 18 feeds into 14, yes. As does the areas west and south of Route 96 and the Thruway. What is going to happen is part of the towns Auburn Trail sewer project, the areas west and south of Route 96 and Thruway, are going to be diverted to a new trunk line that will follow the Auburn Trail. That is going to alleviate the demand on PS 14 and the areas thru Cobblestone Golf Course. That is going create more capacity. That area will be able to accommodate this project, as well as, PS 18 will accommodate this project after the town’s capital improvement project is constructed and operational. We talked about this a month or so ago. We anticipate the town’s sewer project will be completed and operational in August to September 2020. If I recall correctly in Fred saying that maybe they would be looking to come online in quarter four 2020. There is a bit of a timing component to this but I felt it might be worthy to note in SEQR that is was a moderate to large impact.

Mr. Gallina – We can put as risk mitigation as Part 3 response, right?

Mr. Logan – Is 14 going to be done earlier than all that? Will it be upgraded this year?

Mr. Pettee – PS 14 is part of the larger capital improvement project. That would be done within this time span to be online and operational by August/September 2020. It is being addressed now. We actually have a meeting scheduled for tomorrow evening with the residents surrounding where that pump station is because it is going to be above ground in an enclosed structure and so there is a meeting on that.

Mr. Rainaldi – The only thing we had discussed quite briefly at two meetings ago was if practical that I don’t envision any phase portion coming online before quarter four of 2020. That is

accurate and conservative. One of the tools that is used in leasing and showing very specific details of the units themselves is to construct a model. If the calcs support it, it would be my request that the Board would consider allowing for a single structure that would be used primarily for a model and management office to allow people to have guaranteed hours that it'll be open so that we can show people thru the product and understanding what the quality of life would be with these units.

Mr. Logan – Are you in the process of building 300 or is that still down the road?

Mr. Rainaldi – It is likely I will be in front of you celebrating a full building tenant for 300 within the next six calendar months.

Mr. Logan – Does that building once constructed impact 14 and 18?

Mr. Pettee – Yes it would.

Mr. Logan – Would you be able to put it online before 14 and 18 are upgraded?

Mr. Rainaldi – That building would likely have a further occupancy date then quarter four of 2020. Several things would drive that conclusion. This building has an extra story and it quite beautiful. Because of the design style and energy code and demands of the unique features related to the entity that would occupy this for a very long time we would likely bring this on line as quarter one 2021 or that summer of 2021. Between the planning process and we everything we need to do to get ready to break ground is that we have some time yet.

Mr. Pettee has a graph shown on screen of sanitary sewer. Points out project area and where Pump Stations are located.

Mr. Pettee – Pump 18 pumps down High Street then over to 14 in Cobblestone then goes down County Road 9 over to PS 6. The waste water plant is in this vicinity here. You can see all of these pump stations that are over here on the west side of town go to PS 28 and they pump up and over the hill. The topography requires so many pumping stations. All of these flows in this area as well as anything down in Lehigh Crossing area. The flows that come to PS 28 are going to be diverted. They are going to stay in the low lands of Victor. You can see the geologic formations of maybe a really old stream or river that came thru here. The Auburn Trail and rather than pumping it up and over the hill all these flows will be diverted and fewer pumping stations and over to waste water treatment plant. You can see how the diversion of these flows is going to create additional capacity for PS 14 and the downstream conveyance system.

Finally the last question, number 18 consistency with community character. The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character. We have said “No”. That concludes taking a look at Part 2 of the EAF. What we can do in preparation for the next meeting is create a Part 3 a reason to elaboration for the responses here and provide a draft Part 2 and 3 that would potentially be feasible for adopting a negative declaration resolution. I think something that we would need however is some updated plans. We can at least progress SEQR a little bit farther at the next meeting with a draft of Part 3 as well.

Motion was made by Joe Logan seconded by Heather Zollo RESOLVED the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 PM.