

Village of Geneseo Planning Board Work Session 02/10/2010

**Members Present:**

Matt Griffo, Chair  
Dori Farthing  
Claren Kruppner  
David Woods

**Village Representatives Present:**

Dean O'Keefe, Code Enforcement Officer  
J. Thomas Reynolds, Attorney  
Scott DeHollander, Engineer - MRB Group

**Applicants Present:**

David Young, Engineer, Larson Design Group – Hampton Inn  
Jim Olverd, Kircher Construction – Hampton Inn

**Public Present:**

Sharon Roach, 4297 Reservoir Road  
Lars Mazzola, 4285 Reservoir Road  
Jane Fowler Morse, 4285 Reservoir Road

**1. Work Session Opened:**

Chair Griffo opened the work session at 4:31PM.

**2. Work Session Notes:**

The January 20, 2010 work session notes were reviewed. D. Farthing moved to approve the notes as presented. D. Woods seconded the motion and the motion passed with ayes from all.

**3. Hampton Inn – SEQRA Review:**

D. Woods stated that on Saturday, January 30, 2010, he, Chair Griffo, CEO Maxwell, CEO O'Keefe and MRB Group Engineer K. Rappazzo met to review the SEQRA document submitted to the Planning Board for the proposed Hampton Inn project.

During that meeting, it was noticed that the Livingston County Industrial Development Agency was not sent a letter regarding the Planning Board's intentions of becoming Lead Agency for this project. Therefore, a letter was sent to them on February 2, 2010 and a letter was received back from them today, February 10, 2010, stating that they did not have a problem with the Planning Board being the Lead Agency.

At this time, the SEQRA form was reviewed.

**Page 1 of 21**

It was noted that the Determination of Significance would either be:

- A. The project will not will result in any large and important impact(s) and, therefore, is one, which will not have a significant impact on the environment, therefore a negative declaration will be prepared.
- B. Although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect for this Unlisted Action because the mitigation measures described in Part 3 have been required, therefore, a CONDITIONED negative declaration will be prepared.
- C. The project may result in one or more large and important impacts that may have a significant impact on the environment; therefore a positive declaration will be prepared.

It was agreed that the determination of significance would probably be either A or C, not B.

**Part I Page 2 of 21**

The location of action should be 4250 Lakeville Road per Livingston County E911 records not 4260 Lakeville Road as listed.

**Part I Page 3 of 21**

Question #3 – What is the predominant soil type(s) of this project site?

Besides Lima that was listed it was also found to have Kendaia.

Also, Soil drainage has been determined to be 75% moderately well drained and 25% poorly drained.

**Part I Page 10 of 21**

E. Verification

If the applicant or applicants representative agrees with the revisions that have been made to Part I the Board asks for their signature. Engineer Young agreed with the revisions and stated he would be signing Part I on behalf of the applicant.

**Part II Page 11 of 21**

Part II – Project Impacts and their Magnitude is the responsibility of the Lead Agency.

The specific impact(s) are measured in magnitudes of:

1. Small to Moderate
2. Potential Large Impact
3. Can Impact be mitigated by project change – Yes or No

**Impact on Land Pages 11-12 of 21**

1. Will the proposed action result in a physical change to the project site?

Yes.

Three of the nine bullet points were checked as small to moderate:

- Any construction on slopes of 15% or greater, (15 foot rise per 100 foot of length), or where the general slopes in the project area exceed 10%
- Construction on land where the depth to the water table is less than 3 feet.
- Construction on land where bedrock is exposed or generally within 3 feet of existing ground surface.

2. Will there be an effect to any unique or unusual land forms found on the site?

No.

**Impact on Water Pages 12-14 of 21**

3. Will proposed action affect any water body designated as protected?

Yes.

Two of the five bullet points were checked as small to moderate:

- Developable area of site contains a protected water body.
  - Extension of utility distribution facilities through a protected water body.
4. Will proposed action affect any non-protected existing or new body of water?  
No.
5. Will proposed action affect surface or groundwater quality of quantity?  
Yes.  
Two of the twelve bullet points were checked as small to moderate:
- Proposed Action requires will require a discharge permit.
  - Proposed Action will likely cause siltation or other discharge into an existing body of water to the extent that there will be an obvious visual contrast to natural conditions.
6. Will proposed action alter drainage flow or patterns, or surface water?  
Yes.  
One of the five bullet points were checked as a potential large impact, however, Yes was checked for whether or not the impact can be mitigated by project change.
- Proposed Action may cause substantial erosion.

**Impact on Air Pages 14-14 of 21:**

7. Will proposed action affect air quality?  
No.

**Impact on Plants and Animals Pages 14-15 of 21:**

8. Will proposed action affect any threatened or endangered species?  
No.
9. Will proposed action substantially affect non-threatened or non-endangered species?  
No

**Impact on Agricultural Land Resources Pages 15-16 of 21:**

10. Will proposed action affect agricultural land resources?  
No.

**Impact on Aesthetic Resources Pages 16-16 of 21:**

11. Will proposed action affect aesthetic resources?  
No.

**Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources Pages 16-17 of 21:**

12. Will proposed action impact any site or structure of historic, prehistoric or paleontological importance?  
Yes.  
One of the four bullet points was checked as small to moderate:

- Proposed action will occur in an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NYS Site Inventory.

**Impact on Open Space and Recreation Pages 16-17 of 21:**

13. Will proposed action affect the quantity or quality of existing or future open spaces or recreational opportunities?

No.

**Impact on Critical Environmental Areas Pages 17-17 of 21:**

14. Will proposed action impact the exceptional or unique characteristics of a critical environmental area (CEA) established pursuant to subdivision 6NYCRR 617.14(g)?

No.

**Impact on Transportation Pages 18-18 of 21:**

15. Will there be an affect to the existing transportation system?

Yes.

One of the three bullet points was checked as small to moderate.

- Other: There will be a minimum increase in daily traffic volumes on NYS Route 20A.

**Impact on Energy Pages 18-18 of 21:**

16. Will proposed action affect the community's sources of fuel or energy supply?

No.

**Impact on Noise and Odor Pages 18-18 of 21:**

17. Will there be objectionable odors, noise, or vibration as a result of the proposed action?

Yes.

Two of the five bullet points were checked as small to moderate:

- Odors will occur routinely (more than one hour per day).
- Proposed action will remove natural barriers that would act as a noise screen.

**Impact on Public Health Pages 19-19 of 21:**

18. Will proposed action affect public health and safety?

No.

**Impact on Growth and Character of Community or Neighborhood Pages 19-20 Of 21:**

19. Will proposed action affect the character of the existing community?

No.

20. Is there, or is there likely to be, public controversy related to potential adverse environmental impacts?

Yes.

**Part III – Evaluation of the Importance of Impacts Page 21 of 21:**

Part III must be prepared if one or more impact(s) is considered to be potentially large even if the impact(s) may be mitigated.

**Question #6: Will proposed action alter drainage flow or patterns, or surface water?**

Yes.

One of the five bullet points were checked as a potential large impact and a yes was checked for can the impact be mitigated or changed.

Applicant has submitted a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which, if adhered to, will mitigate the potential substantial erosion during construction.

**Question #12: Will proposed action impact any site or structure of historic, prehistoric or paleontological importance?**

Yes.

One of the four bullet points was checked as small to moderate.

Applicant has provided “Cultural Resource Management Report, Phase I Cultural Resource Reconnaissance Survey for the Proposed Hampton Inn,” prepared by Rochester Museum & Science Center, December 9, 2009. Report concluded that, “The project area exhibited a distinct lack of prehistoric Native American cultural material,” and recommended that, “...no further archaeological work be undertaken...” Therefore, the proposed project will have no significant impact upon cultural resources.

**Question #15: Will there be an affect to the existing transportation system?**

Yes.

One of the three bullet points was checked as small to moderate.

The following was noted: There will be a minimum increase in daily traffic volumes on NYS Route 20A.

Applicant has provided “Traffic Impact Study for Proposed Hampton Inn,” prepared by Larson Design Group, September 2009. Report states that the traffic generated by the project will not have a significant negative impact upon existing traffic patterns on NYS Route 20A. Letter from NYS DOT dated January 7, 2010, states that, “...the traffic projected for the Hampton Inn will have little to no impact on the need for a three color traffic signal at the Route 20A and Ryan Drive/site driveway intersection.

Chair Griffo asked if Attorney J. Thomas Reynolds or Engineer DeHollander had anything to add. They did not. Mr. Young, Larson Design group stated that he wanted to state for the record that there are no plans for a restaurant in the Inn. There will be a pantry or Breakfast Bar, but no real kitchen, no lunches or dinners will be served.

Chair Griffo stated that without objection from the Board, Attorney Reynolds or the applicant, he would allow Mr. Mazzola to make a brief comment as a courtesy, reminding him that this is not a public hearing and all correspondences have been taken into consideration.

Mr. Mazzola stated on behalf of the Reservoir Road Coalition, that the buffer is still an issue and wonders why it was not discussed at the last Planning Board meeting; therefore they feel it is necessary to bring it up now. He continued by stating that the Livingston County Planning Board laid down a 150’ buffer but it has been reduced six times that amount to 25’, the Reservoir Road Coalition feels this is very inadequate. The Board should favor the residential character over the commercial and they feel as though the scale has been tipped in favor of the Hampton Inn not the residents. He continued by

stating that the Reservoir residents are looking for a minimum 50' buffer but would like more than that.

Ms. Morse commented that she believes Board has already decided that this project will only have a small to moderate impact on Geneseo, but the Reservoir Road Coalition believes it is a large impact. In allowing the Hampton Inn, the Planning Board is not preserving the historic character of the Village, and even though a barrier fence is planned for between the Reservoir Road properties and the Inn, they will get noise and much more light than they do now.

Chair Griffo stated that all correspondences and comments have been taken into consideration. Mr. Mazzola stated that he was curious as to what that exactly means. Chair Griffo explained that the Board has discussed the buffer area considerably. Mr. Mazzola wondered if that meant that the Board has concluded that the 25' buffer is adequate. Chair Griffo explained that the Board has not decided that yet. Attorney Reynolds stated that the Board when it comes time would make its decision with its supporting reasons to why they made that decision.

The Board agreed that the next step was to entertain a motion for a negative or positive SEQRA declaration. Chair Griffo asked if the Board had any more concerns or questions. D. Farthing asked if an updated SWPPP (Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan) had been submitted. Engineer DeHollander stated that a updated SWPP had been submitted to him this evening along with a revised set of plans and as far as he his concerned the Board could go forward with their SEQRA decision noting that most issues at this point are technical in nature.

With no further discussion, D. Woods moved that the Hampton Inn project will not result in any large and important impact(s) and therefore, is one which will not have a significant impact on the environment, therefore a Negative Declaration should be granted. C. Kruppner seconded the motion noting that any impacts will be mitigated. With no further discussion, the motion passed with ayes from all.

#### **4. Work Session Closed:**

C. Kruppner moved to close the work session at 5:05PM with second from D. Woods and the motion passed with ayes from all.

Aprile S. Mack, Secretary