

**Town of Geneseo Planning Board  
Regular Monthly Meeting Minutes  
May 11, 2009  
7:00 – 8:30 P.M.**

**Members Present:**

Marcea Clark Tetamore  
Hank Latorella  
Patti LaVigne  
David Woods  
Mark Shepard

**Others:**

Ron Hull, Esq.  
Rosemarie Visco, Premium Development Corporation  
CEO Ron Maxwell

**Excused:**

Dwight Folts  
Tom Curtin

1. **Call to Order:**

Vice Chair Patti LaVigne called the monthly meeting to order in the board room of the Town Offices at 7:00 p.m.

2. **Review of Minutes:**

The minutes of the Planning Board's work meeting on April 27, 2009 were reviewed.

**David Woods made the MOTION to accept the minutes as corrected.**

**Mark Shepard SECONDED the motion.**

**All in favor: Hank Latorella, Patti LaVigne, David Woods, and Mark Shepard.**

**Abstained: Marcea Clark Tetamore**

**Opposed: None.**

**MOTION PASSED.**

3. **Code Office Report:**

The Code Office Report for the period 04/01/09 through 04/30/09 was received and reviewed by the Planning Board. CEO Maxwell reported that the code officers are busy with rentals currently. Coast Professional resumed construction as of today as the engineer said he was "okay with the foundation."

4. **Continuing Discussion Regarding Changes to the Architectural Guidelines for the Gateway and Business District.**

***PLEASE SEE ATTACHED DRAFT FOR THIS DISCUSSION.***

**5. New/Other Business:**

Vice Chair LaVigne reported that Newman is expected at the Planning Board's June meeting in order to present their plans for the new bank. Ron Hull, Esq. said he believes the PDD law will need to be amended as it refers to a "pharmacy" rather than a "bank." This will require a public hearing

The secretary will email Jim Coniglio, Esq., regarding the generic SEQR statement/analysis to reduce the time needed for individual projects when they present to the Planning Board. This "generic environmental impact statement" item will also be placed on the June agenda.

**6. Adjournment.**

There being no additional business, the meeting ended at 8:30 p.m.

**Marcea Clark Tetamore made a MOTION to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m.**

**Mark Shepard SECONDED the motion.**

**All in favor: David Woods, Hank Latorella, Mark Shepard, and Patti LaVigne.**

**Opposed: None.**

**MOTION PASSED.**

Respectfully submitted,

Diane McMullan, Secretary  
Town of Geneseo Planning Board

dmm  
Attachment

# DRAFT

Town of Geneseo  
Gateway District Design Standards  
Geneseo Planning Board Comments  
May 11, 2009

1. The standard overall, does not seem to accommodate or allow modification for non-retail uses such as commercial and industrial uses.
2. Organization is cumbersome with multiple sub-subsets making references or citation of particular areas difficult.
3. Need to add the definitions that were included with the original village document.
4. Figures do not correlate with copy and do not always accurately describe the concepts being presented
5. Page 1. Should the Gateway Standards refer to the Low Intensity Office District as well as the Gateway Overlay District and the Business District?
6. Explain the differences between fronting and frontage.
7. Page 1. 2c: Bergmann needs to expand on what is the district identity and what is the historic/architectural character that is being complemented. What is “acceptable architecture in the area”, provide examples. How was historical character defined in the original document? There was concern that there are examples of less than desirable architecture in the area and this document would all the use of those buildings as a baseline.
8. Page 2, Drive in facilities: the paragraph is vague and the purpose unclear. Why is it mandated that they be in the rear, depending on the building and the layout, it may not always be the best option.
9. Page 3, 2a, b define/list what is considered appropriate screening.
10. Page 2, Storm water facilities: Applicants should be asked to submit storm water pollution prevention plans with their application for site plan review to ensure compatibility. These requirements should be worded so as not to conflict with federal or state law. Also need to review placement of existing retention and proposed retention ponds designed in the original Gateway project. Bergman needs to clarify why retention ponds always need to be in the rear? Does this preclude the use of fountains and other

# DRAFT

attractive enhancement for in front of building systems? Why can't attractive fences be used around retention ponds?

11. Page 3 (5a) Shared parking may not always be acceptable due to conflicts with ownership and maintenance. There needs to be more flexibility, suggest adding "where practical" or similar verbiage
12. Page 5, (2) b parking rooms, question if always appropriate for non- retail areas, concerns about snow removal (both plowing and piling of remaining snow) and access by fire equipment.
13. Page 5 (4), explain the rational for curbing, for example, uniformity of appearance, drainage and boundary demarcation. Is curbing really required in all areas of the Gateway?
14. Page 5, 1c, frontage distances and setbacks, paragraph is confusing, needs clarification, Figure #3 does not show 30%. Does the 30% refer to linear distance versus square footage?
15. Page 6, suggest eliminating the list of acceptable trees and replace with "...species endemic, indigenous, hardy: those species known to be non-invasive to this area and deer-resistant." Landscape architects can then select the appropriate species.
16. Page 8, Parking and landscaping, align copy with Figure 5, better define "parking lot circulation aisle, # 8 in this figure, fit to scale and include parking islands.
17. Page 9, explain the rationale for requiring 70% street level transparency for retail uses. What about issues of privacy. What about uses that are both retail and service oriented?
18. Page 9 #2 front yards; explain the rational for the exclusion of vegetation along the front of buildings. What constitutes a "front yard in this district"? It should also include that mulching made of combustible materials may not be placed next to structures and that stone is required.
19. Page 11, define "foundation water table in 3B
20. There needs to be a statement that all projects need to be compliant with existing fire code.
21. Page 9, Public Transit, Why is the town the holder of the easement, does there need to be noted that access to public transit needs to meet ADA requirements. What are the

# DRAFT

Livingston Area Transportation Service standards and are they different from the RGTA standards? They should be incorporated in the document.

22. Page 9, 1b is the same as verbiage is almost the same as page 10 d1, does it need to be in both places.
23. Page 9,4c Why is it necessary to have first floor transparency in buildings with commercial uses?
24. Page 11, Architectural; details: The overall goal is to prevent uniform flat walls. The standard should allow for more variety of enhancements including artificial windows and accents that protect privacy and that can provide the desired appearance.
25. Page 11, (3) windows, provide examples of appropriate window trimming and materials.