APPROVED

Town of Geneseo
Planning Board Special Work Meeting
Tuesday, May 27, 2008

Members Present:
Dwight Folts, Chairman
Tom Curtin
Trish Jones
Patti LaVigne
Hank Latorella
Mark Shepard
Margery Wilkie

Others:
See attached for additional names.

Also Present
William Holthoff, PE, Stantec
Michael Guyon, PE
Joseph Picciotti, Esq. Harris Beach

1. <u>Call to Order:</u>

Chair Folts called the special meeting to order in the board room of the Town Offices at 7 p.m. He explained briefly to those present that this was an open meeting but comments and/or questions from the public should be held for another time. All discussion would be with board members and those they questioned.

2. <u>Review of Minutes:</u>

The minutes of the May 12, 2008 Planning Board meeting were reviewed. It was the consensus of the Board that item 7, Gateway Towne Center: Findings Statement Debate, needs to be expanded. Tom Curtin requested the record show there was lengthy discussion-- more than was reflected in the minutes. Especially after the sentence--Both Hank Latorella and Tom Curtin spoke about compromise and trade-offs--- and just before Tom Curtin made a MOTION.

At the bottom of that page, in the third paragraph from the bottom, CP4 should be CP5. On the last page under new business, Hank distributed a draft of a motion for mobile homes and Lakeville Estates. Minutes will be revisited on June 9.

3. <u>Executive Session</u>:

Hank Latorella moved to go into Executive Session. Chairman Folts explained they were to discuss personnel issues as well as pending law suits. **Tom Curtin seconded. All in favor: Margery Wilkie, Dwight Folts, Patti LaVigne, Trish Jones, Tom Curtin, Hank Latorella and Mark Shepard.**

Opposed: None. MOTION PASSED.

The Board left the room at that time rather than to ask the audience to leave. At 7:27 the Board returned and **Trish Jones MOVED and Hank Latorella Seconded that they come out of Executive Session.**
All in favor: Margery Wilkie, Dwight Folts, Patti LaVigne, Trish Jones, Tom Curtin, Hank Latorella and Mark Shepard.
Opposed: None. MOTION PASSED.

4. <u>Gateway Towne Center- Size of the Building and then Orientation</u>:

Chair Dwight Folts noted that at the last Findings meeting some changes were made and further discussion was now to take place. First, **SIZE OF THE BUILDING** and then, ORIENTATION. Tom Lucey is invited first to discuss the new dimensions he sent to the Board.

Size of Building:

Tom Lucey referenced his handout with a chart of building comparison with other area stores in Brockport and Henrietta, the original Geneseo proposal and the Geneseo reduced proposal as well. Henrietta store was build in mid 90's and called a 121 prototype (sales area within the building itself). Brockport is a 117 prototype and it is similar to the original Geneseo proposal. The smallest prototype is a 103 (103,000 sq. ft. of sales area).

There were questions of the overall size and the chart shows the breakdown of areas by sales area, storage/loading area and garden center area. Garden centers are all around 31,000 sq. ft. but for Henrietta which was built earlier. The Board was considering the overall area of 140,000 sq. ft. overall, which is smaller than any existing Lowes. If the sales area goes below 103K, the store suffers a loss of sales area and storage area; it changes its functionality of building and their ability to run a successful store.

Hank Latorella questioned how the loading dock in the storage area relates to the rest of the area. Tom Lucey answered that the loading dock area is primarily on the back of the building. It is integral to the side of the building. The storage area is on the back of the building. On this proposal it is on the back right corner behind the garden center. In old plans they discussed an appendage to the back of the building to turn the loading dock so that it was facing away from the road. The dock is around 3600 sq. ft. The architect will design it ultimately. Different orientations of the dock can work and would be done in Site Plan Review.

Trish asked if the asterisk on the bottom of the chart were there to explain that you would need a little more sq. footage to rotate, if necessary. Yes.

Dwight asked about the impact of employment in the smaller building. Taylor McDermott said it would be the same. The 103K prototype has narrower aisles, the same

stock, same employees, etc. Everything would just be compressed, like an accordion.

Margery Wilkie stated that Wal-Mart has a garden center that is enclosed. Can this center be made so that it doesn't look so separate (no chain link fence)? Need to put that in today? Dwight suggested this belongs in Site Plan review later.

Tom Curtin questioned that this is the formal proposal from the Newman Group to reduce the size to 155,433. Dwight Folts said it was his understanding. The asterisk should remain to accommodate architectural changes necessary. Hank Latorella asked if that change should be made now. Dwight Folts indicated yes, that if that was the consensus of the Board

Joseph Picciotti spoke up to say as he will be the scribe for changes to the final document, what is the basis for the Board's change? The consensus of the Board is to make the change to the size fitting the community character and smaller than the Brockport and Henrietta Lowes and having less impact on the view shed.

Tom Curtin wonders about the legal precedents to future projects. In the past we were concerned about size. If we don't take action, will it affect the future? Joseph Picciotti said every project stands on its own. It helps to say the board had size concerns in the past and did something about it. It can only help you.

At this time the Board, looking at the chart, pinpointed what the size is to be. The sales area will be 104,079, the storage/loading area will be 19,997 with an asterisk for the loading dock and 31,357 for the garden center for a total of 155,433*(approximate).

Orientation:

Dwight Folts moved on to questions of orientation and asked to revisit CP5 vs. CP3 because the Board now has new information and our traffic expert, Bill Holthoff, is here to explain the differences.

At this time maps were brought out showing each plan. Dwight Folts spoke to the public explaining that Bill Holthoff is a traffic expert to explain the flow of traffic in the parking area when using an entrance from 20A (CP5) or just Volunteer Road (CP3)

Mr. Holthoff then explained that in the CP5 and CP3 plans, the trucks would come in from 20A, and backloading is different in each plan.

Dwight Folts asked what backloading is. Bill Holthoff said cars come in by the entrance roads and drive into the back of the parking lot and search for a spot closest to the store, park and enter the store. That is CP5. This approach focuses traffic to the back of the parking and away from the store. They find spaces easier and don't spend as much time looking around. Since they are coming in and going out the back there is less pedestrian and cars mixing.

CP3's orientation backloading concept is similar. Cars would be coming off of Volunteer and 20A. However, there is a greater tendency for cars to proceed in front of the store and then into the parking aisles.

Margery Wilkie asked if it would be better then to cut off the entrance to 20A. Bill Holthoff said No. If you are cutting off the entrance to 20A, you are also cutting off the truck entrance. Margery Wilkie understands that, but this is a Volunteer Road development. That means it faces Volunteer Rd.

Bill Holthoff is just trying to explain the subtle difference in the two concerning traffic and pedestrian traffic. There are fewer pedestrian possible points with the back loading. This one ends up having fewer driveways and fewer vehicle conflicts with those coming from the back. Hank Latorella commented that it is still back loaded with the exception that 20A entrance/exit is intended for trucks and for emergency vehicles.

Bill Holthoff pointed out you will still get other traffic turning from 20A. Hank Latorella clarified that the primary reason for the entrance from 20A was for truck traffic and emergency vehicles. Bill Holthoff added that it also puts less pressure on the intersection of 20A and Volunteer. Margery Wilkie commented that the primary reason for the 20A entrance was for emergency vehicles. That was the big, big item.

The loss of the 20A entrance will have an impact and have everybody coming in on Volunteer would send all that traffic basically through Volunteer and 20A opposite Wegman's and reduce the overall capacity of that intersection for traffic safety.

Hank Latorella asked, in comparing with the Henrietta store. The main entrance is across from the gas station on Hylan Dr. with a secondary entrance by Sears. Most of the loading and unloading of that parking lot is through the main exit. The minor one is not heavily used. Bill Holthoff agreed. Backload in your design is the preference. Dwight Folts interjected in Henrietta there are 6 lanes of traffic, unlike 20A. The impact will be greater for not having the entrance for truck traffic, as well as for serving people coming from the east.

Trish Jones spoke to CP5 as being the best choice to reduce the view shed because it's angled and minimizes the wet land impact. Dwight Folts pointed out that most of the Board held that view except for Margery Wilkie who has never agreed to that. That was a compromise made to reduce the impact on the view shed because there is an ad hoc group in this community concerned with blocking the view shed and it minimizes the effect on the watershed. It is not huge but it is there.

Tom Curtin pointed out that CP5 and CP3 are similar in their impact on the viewshed. Mike Guyon pointed out that lowering the building won't affect the view shed unless you go down 20 feet. CP5 provides a better view shed but it is an indiscernible difference.

Hank Latorella returned to the community character when having Lowes front onto 20A as the main view. By reducing the size, it reduces the wet land impact. No matter which

you choose, you will mitigate the wetlands.

Mike Guyon, pointed out that pg 21, paragraph 41 of FINDINGS STATEMENT of May 27, 2008 summarizes the above discussion.

Trish Jones. In CP5 the look of the back side of the building with the loading docks isn't as good as the front of the building. Margery Wilkie asked if she had seen Wegman's in Pittsford where the back of the building faces the road and it looks fine. Trish Jones said you don't see the loading docks in Pittsford.

Patti LaVigne commented on how we guide development in the future. If the front of the building is on 20A future development won't want to face the back of the building. The whole project was to be on an internal drive and that meant Volunteer Rd, to encourage future development down Volunteer. Otherwise future growth will go out 20A.

Trish Jones asked if there isn't still a chunk of developable land next to that on 20A. Patti LaVigne said yes, a 14 acre parcel with an access road to it from Morgan Dr. and whatever goes in there will be looking at the back of the other building. At some point and time someone will come in but maybe we can encourage it to come in Volunteer and stay interior more than going up 20A.

Margery Wilkie wonders why we assume the back is going to be trashy. The a Architectural Review Board will be very strict. The back won't be trashy.

Tom Curtin, on the orientation: How to reconcile to the internal road (not necessarily Volunteer Road per se). Trish Jones added that Volunteer wasn't built when the language was written in the code. CP5 is a compromise. This project can face the new road going 45 degrees into the development off 20A and front onto 20A.

Hank Latorella said anticipating future roads and road blocks is not good. Patti LaVigne commented that sprawl will continue because there are no halts to 20A frontage. Trish Jones countered that internal roads with others will be coming off Volunteer Road (the new road from 20A).

Margery Wilkie said all new roads would come off Volunteer. Patti LaVigne added that we can't build interior roads until we cease facing 20A. Road front development will continue up to the houses.

Hank Latorella said that as there is future development, the need for access could be fulfilled by a T-road. Bill Holthoff commented it is like putting in subdivisions or dedicated roads in a shopping center. There will be in future a road opposite Morgan Road.

Mike Guyon read from the Gateway zoning wording: uses which are developed after the construction of the internal road system serving a parcel or development is proposed in the overlay district shall be required to take access via that road system will not be

permitted to develop any access directly to Route 20A or Lima Rd.

Dwight Folts asked Mark Shepard if he had any thought. Mark responded that he wanted to discuss the views from 20A for this project. The Board then looked at the renderings and CP3 isn't as nice as CP5. Margery Wilkie said the back view wouldn't look like that picture. It would have windows, even if they aren't real windows. That side can be made to look nice. Mark Shepard observed the view of CP5 is much better than CP3.

Dwight Folts mentioned approaches and view shed. The view continually changes depending on your location when looking at it. He then asked for a straw poll. The majority support CP3. (4-3)

Hank Latorella wanted to discuss Lowes and the pharmacy and brick vs. block. He wants mainly brick. That comes under Site Plan, commented Dwight Folts.

The grade next came under discussion. It shouldn't exceed 2%. Was that on the drive into the parking lot or the actual parking lot? What is the comfort level? 2%? 4% is ok. Applebee's is 5% in the back corner and people park there and walk up to the restaurant. The grade will be addressed in Site Plan Review.

Mike Guyon spoke up. The parking will not be steep. The drive can be steeper than the parking lot. This will be covered in Site Plan.

Dwight Folts asked if there were other issues. Tom Curtin wanted to discuss the peak where he hopes a compromise can be made addressing community character and aesthetics. Not all Lowes have peaks. Taylor McDermott commented that the architect will come to discuss the peak if you want.

Trish Jones pointed out that a lower size facility should equal a smaller parking lot and a smaller number of parking spaces. We could say approximately 648 parking spaces and then put in the smallest parking lot possible.

Joseph Picciotti asked if the board is satisfied with Mike Guyon's recitation of the Board's determination as to CP3 vs. CP5 as set forth in the draft findings. The applicant has submitted in response to concerns raised by the Board at the last meeting and previously a reduced size, the Board finds that that reduced size is more in keeping with the community character based on the Board's view and review of similar uses in other communities and for that reason finds that the smaller size is a better fit in this community, is in keeping with community character and further that the smaller size would have less of an impact on the view shed. There was also a statement which that the smaller size would address the potential precedential concerns that the Board has raised in the past about perhaps future development and the fact that it would demonstrate that this Board has sensitivity to that issue and is in keeping with underlying zoning and plans for the community.

Joseph Picciotti continued to summarize. The Board has addressed the community

character issues. The building size will be as set out in the document provided to us by the applicant's consultant which show the approximate building size and depend on the loading dock appendage mitigating visual and wetland impacts. The sales area will be 104,079, the storage/loading area will be 19,997 with an asterisk for the loading dock and 31,357 for the garden center for a total of 155,433*(approximate).

Joseph Picciotti continued to summarize. The Board along the line of community character has expressed concerns about grading and has expects and will require the applicant to work with the town engineer to ensure that the grading is appropriate as possible and as low as possible given the concerns about "walkability" and the like and similarly with the building peak, that the building peak be a low as possible to avoid impacts to view shed. The architect will be ready to discuss the peak to be as low as possible.

Dwight Folts asked if the Board were ready to take action. Hank Latorella moved and Trish Jones seconded the MOTION to accept the Positive Findings as Amended. Joseph Picciotti asked that the secretary read into the record the following:

Having considered the draft and final EIS, the restated final EIS, and having considered the preceding written facts and conclusions, relied upon to meet the requirements, of 6NY CRR617.9 et al.

This statement of Finds certifies that 1) The requirements of 6NYCRR part 617 et al have been met, Consistent with the social economic and other essential considerations from among the reasonable alternatives thereto ,the action is one which minimizes the avoids adverse environmental effects to the maximum extent practicable, including the effects disclosed in the environmental impact statement and consistent with social, economic and other essential considerations to the maximum extent practicable.

Adverse environmental effects revealed in the environmental impact statement process will be minimized or avoided by incorporating as conditions to the decision those mitigative measures which were identified as practicable.

All in favor of a Positive Finding: **Margery Wilkie, Dwight Folts, Patti LaVigne, Trish Jones, Tom Curtin, Hank Latorella and Mark Shepard. No nays. No abstentions.**

Dwight Folts then addressed his comments to the Town Board. This Board is looking forward to a request for our recommendations on the next steps for architecture and site plan.

5. Hank Latorella moved to <u>adjourn</u>. Margery Wilkie seconded. Motion carried.
Meeting closed at 8:30.

Respectfully submitted by acting Secretary, Carolyn C. Meisel.
Amended at June 9, 2008 Planning Board Meeting,
Diane McMullan, Secretary