

**Town of Geneseo Planning Board
Regular Monthly Meeting Minutes
June 8, 2009
7:00 – 9:05 P.M.**

Members Present:

Marcea Clark Tetamore
Tom Curtin
Dwight Folts
Hank Latorella
Patti LaVigne
Mark Shepard
David Woods

Others:

Jim Coniglio, Esq.
Dawn Aprile, Premium Development Corporation
CEO Ron Maxwell
Ken Kamlet, Esq., Newman Development
John Girolamo, APD
Ray Ford, Consultant
Al Bushnell, AIA
Joe Berkhart, ESL
Peter Woods, Esq.

1. **Call to Order:**

Chair Dwight Folts called the regular monthly meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the board room of the Town Offices.

2. **Review of Minutes:**

The minutes of the Planning Board's work meeting on May 11, 2009 were reviewed. It was noted that the attachment to those minutes was only a DRAFT and that word was inserted on those pages.

Marcea Clark Tetamore made the MOTION to accept the minutes as corrected.

David Woods SECONDED the motion.

All in favor: Hank Latorella, Patti LaVigne, David Woods, Marcea Clark Tetamore and Mark Shepard.

Abstained: Dwight Folts and Tom Curtin.

Opposed: None.

MOTION PASSED.

3. **Code Office Report:**

The Code Office Report for the period 05/01/09 through 05/31/09 was received and reviewed by the Planning Board. CEO Maxwell reported that the C of O was extended for Peter Bruckel. Grading and seeding is to be done soon to the Reservoir Road property.

CEO Dean O'Keefe has spoken with TSC and black film is to be woven into the fence to improve appearance. This will alleviate replacing the black cloth on the fence every year.

4. **CONCEPT/PRELIMINARY APPROVAL: Site Plan and Special Use Permit application for a new bank (ESL) to be located in the Gateway Town Centre, Tax No. 81.-1-29.113 (portion).**

John Girolamo from APD gave the presentation on the ESL Federal Credit Union which will replace the original pharmacy site in the Gateway. Mr. Girolamo pointed out that the pharmacy was estimated to encompass 15,000 sq. ft. while the credit union will be 5,700 sq. ft.

The design plans for the site were shown and questions were invited from Planning Board members. It was noted by Mr. Girolamo that greenspace will be maintained with only one tree removed. Of note, the berm along 20A remains.

Traffic will increase slightly with ten additional trips during peak hours. Peak hours were defined as 4-7 p.m. weekdays and 11-2 p.m. weekends. These (and other) calculations will be forwarded to MRB as reference was made to Mike Guyon's June 3, 2009 letter and the points raised.

David Woods questioned the necessity of four drive-thru lanes. Joe Berkhart, ESL Project Manager, said the lanes will minimize delay and increase efficiency as one teller handles two lanes.

Hank Latorella asked about a drive-thru being located in the rear of the building or on the other side. Marcea Clark Tetamore said that looking at the berm, the location on the plans for the drive-thru appears to be in the rear. A drive-thru is 24 feet wide.

The architect for the project, Al Bushnell, then made his presentation on the construction of the building. There will be brick and stone up to 12 feet and then EIFS. There is one narrow strip 6 inches high that is a vibrant (ESL) blue. There is a blue standing scene roof above main entrance and drive up canopy. The architect noted that this blue is not as bright as it appears on some of the maps. The base of first 3 feet is cast stone. On top of that is real brick. The roof is flat. The highest point of the roof is <31 feet. The parapet wall is 19 feet.

Patti LaVigne asked about traffic flow and the parking lots. Chair Folts asked Joe Berkhart to speak about the traffic flow. Mr. Berkhart said that two drive-thru lanes and two ATMs avoid stacking and will allow members to enter in from Volunteer. The lanes are close to the setback.

Marcea Clark Tetamore asked about the history of ESL. ESL was originally Eastman Savings and Loan. Peter Woods, General Counsel for Wegmans, said that several years ago Wegmans' FCU merged with ESL. There may even be some Livingston County employers who belong.

Typical construction lasts 6 to 7 months and ESL hopes to begin by fall.

James Coniglio, Esq., then discussed the Proposed Local Law Amendment Section 106-13 (22)(b) of the Geneseo Town Code (copy available in the official records) dealing with a change to the PDD law. After some discussion, Planning Board members decided to ask that "reservoir" be dropped from the term "reservoir space." Attorney Coniglio suggested that the Town Board act as lead agency for the EAF. A short form can be done after the PDD amendment is law.

Tom Curtin made the MOTION to grant CONCEPT/PRELIMINARY APPROVAL to GTC for Site Plan and Special Use Permit application for a new bank (ESL) to be located in the Gateway, Tax No. 81.-1-29.113 (portion).

Marcea Clark Tetamore SECONDED the MOTION.

All in favor: Dwight Folts, Patti LaVigne, Marcea Clark Tetamore, Tom Curtin, Hank Latorella, Mark Shepard, and David Woods.

Opposed: None.

MOTION PASSED.

David Woods made the MOTION that the Planning Board request that the Town Board act as the lead agency for the EAF for the new bank (ESL) to be located in the Gateway, Tax No. 81.-1-29.113 (portion).

Jim Coniglio to supply this wording exactly for the record.

Marcea Clark Tetamore SECONDED the MOTION.

All in favor: Dwight Folts, Patti LaVigne, Marcea Clark Tetamore, Tom Curtin, Hank Latorella, Mark Shepard, and David Woods.

Opposed: None.

MOTION PASSED.

5. Gateway District: Generic SEQR.

Chair Folts asked James Coniglio, Esq., to speak about developing a type of generic environmental impact statement for the above district.

Attorney Coniglio said that the Planning Board has an independent obligation to analyze the data for each individual project even when most of the agencies involved have already signed off for a similar project. (Dawn Aprile has supplied Attorney Coniglio with her documents and approvals already.) The agencies involved may have done all the work previously. Board members must look at the parameters that have been reviewed. For example, SHIPO – Dawn Aprile has done two studies and has submitted both. Attorney Coniglio suggested the Planning Board examine the parameters that have already been identified for the build outs.

A generic EIS is looked at “like a project,” said Attorney Coniglio. All data is already tabulated and involved agencies have signed off. For example, in the Gateway district, Dawn Aprile said the entire 82 acres have been approved/signed off. However, regarding traffic, Attorney Coniglio said those issues will always be somewhat dynamic.

The Planning Board could incorporate what Premium Development has already done plus the property remaining along Volunteer Road. Attorney Coniglio suggests getting an expert such as MRB to look at Dawn Aprile’s data as well as other data.

David Woods would like to recommend to the Town Board that a generic EIS be done to satisfy future projects. Chair Folts offered to communicate this to the Town Board and to recommend that MRB be involved.

David Woods made the MOTION that the Planning Board recommend to the Town Board that a generic environmental impact statement be done in order to consider the impact of future development and that the exact geographic scope be determined.

Mark Shepard SECONDED the MOTION.

All in favor: Dwight Folts, Patti LaVigne, Marcea Clark Tetamore, Tom Curtin, Hank Latorella, Mark Shepard, and David Woods.

Opposed: None.

MOTION PASSED.

6. CONCEPT/PRELIMINARY APPROVAL: Carole Gray 6-lot subdivision located on the west side of West Lake Road, approximately 474 feet north of the northwest corner of West Lake Road, 82.-2-35.21.

Raymond Ford spoke about this subdivision of approximately 17.949 acres. The owner is Carole Gray who would like to subdivide this property into six 2-acre lots – one for each of her children. She will retain the larger lot.

There is water (indicated as a permanent easement). They would have to tap into the sewer across the street. CEO Ron Maxwell said that all that land is in the sewer district but it is hilly. Driveways are not yet determined but there is plenty of room.

Tom Curtin and Marcea Clark Tetamore expressed concern about possible future run-off from these six lots onto adjacent lots.

Notice of Intent must go to DEC for subdivision of five acres for the purpose of building lots, said CEO Maxwell. Request for approval must also be obtained from the County Health Department. CEO Maxwell will check on what approvals are actually needed.

David Woods questioned why this subdivision does not require a long form EAF. Planning Board members discussed and then agreed that a long form seems appropriate. This matter can also be referred to Mike Guyon (per CEO Maxwell) for his opinion.

Mr. Ford questioned the board members' concern about the subdivision. Chair Folts explained that the property in question is part of the Conesus watershed; there has been a lot of effort expended in improving its water quality. The proposed six lots are not flat and run-off could go into the lake as well as on to adjacent lots.

CEO Maxwell suggested the applicant talk to Mike Guyon about storm water run-off.

Mr. Ford said he will arrange to have a topographical map available for the next meeting.

The secretary will send the information on this subdivision application (including a map) to Mike Guyon at MRB.

Tom Curtin made the MOTION to give CONCEPT APPROVAL to the Carole Gray 6-lot subdivision located on the west side of West Lake Road, approximately 474 feet north of the northwest corner of West Lake Road, 82.-2-35.21.

Mark Shepard SECONDED the MOTION.

All in favor: Dwight Folts, Patti LaVigne, Marcea Clark Tetamore, Tom Curtin, Hank Latorella, Mark Shepard, and David Woods.

Opposed: None.

MOTION PASSED.

7. Continuing discussions regarding the architectural guidelines for the Gateway and business district.

The comments compiled by Patti LaVigne (See Attachment #1.) were distributed to board members for discussion. Hank Latorella wants to express to the Town Board that Planning Board members do not agree with some of the guidelines in their original document. Chair Folts requested consensus from the board. Marcea Clark Tetamore said there are questions to be answered first. Andy Raus from Bergmann Associates was asked to come to a Planning Board meeting but never came. Jim Coniglio, Esq. said that Mr. Raus had only spoken before the Town Board.

Both Chair Folts and Attorney Coniglio will phone Supervisor Wadsworth to request that Mr. Raus attend a Planning Board meeting and be available to answer questions.

8. New/Other Business:

There was no other business.

9. Adjournment.

There being no additional business, the meeting ended at 9:05 p.m.

Marcea Clark Tetamore made a MOTION to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

Tom Curtin SECONDED the motion.

All in favor: Dwight Folts, Patti LaVigne, Marcea Clark Tetamore, Tom Curtin, Hank Latorella, Mark Shepard, and David Woods.

Opposed: None.

MOTION PASSED.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane McMullan, Secretary
Town of Geneseo Planning Board

dmm
Attachment

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE
TOWN OF GENESEO CONSENTING TO THE TOWN COUNCIL ACTING AS LEAD
AGENCY STATUS IN CONNECTION WITH AN AMMENDMENT TO SECTION 106-
13 (22) (b) OF THE CODE OF THE TOWN OF GENESEO**

WHEREAS, Gateway Town Centre has applied for an amendment to Town Code Section 106-13 (22) (b) to amend the Planned Development District (“PDD”) to replace the Retail Pharmacy portion of the PDD with a Bank/Credit Union Office (the “Amendment”), and

WHEREAS, Section 106.62 of the Town of Geneseo Code provides that the Planning Board is to act as Lead Agency for any environmental impact reviews required by the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”) unless the Town Council provides otherwise by Resolution, and

WHEREAS, it is the intention of the Planning Board to hereby consent to the Town Council acting as Lead Agency to the extent any additional review under SEQRA may be required.

IT IS RESOLVED that the Planning Board hereby consents to a Resolution of Town Council appointing the Town Council as Lead Agency for any further environmental impact review which may be required under SEQRA in connection with the Application.

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

The items listed below represent questions, concerns and areas for clarification based on discussion at the Town of Geneseo Planning Board meetings on April 27, 2009 and May 11, 2009. All concerns raised are included in the document, and do not necessarily represent group consensus. Our goal was to present one document in an attempt to make the process more streamlined and prevent duplication of questions. The Board would request that a brief statement of rationale or overview for major design standard categories be given, and that this be included in the final draft. It was felt this would facilitate understanding of the guidelines by future boards.

1. The standard overall, does not seem to accommodate or allow modification for non-retail uses such as office 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 apply to the Low Intensity Office District as well as the Gateway Overlay District and the Business District?
6. Need to add definitions for 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 allow 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 2, 2a, b define/list what is considered appropriate screening.
10. Page 2, Storm water facilities: Applicants should be asked to submit Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) 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 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 practicable" 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 shrubs 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. This should also apply to lists on pages 7 and. 8.
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 of Geneseo the holder of the easement. Does it need to be noted that access to public transit needs to meet ADA requirements. Are there

Livingston Area Transportation Service or RGRTA standards? If so, should 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 and retail 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