

Members Present:

Matthew Griffo, Chair
Dori Farthing
Sue Richardson
David Woods
Claren Kruppner

Other Village Representatives Present:

Code Enforcement Officer Dean O'Keefe
Water/Waste Water Superintendent Steve McTarnaghan
MRB | group Engineer Scott DeHollander
Attorney J. Thomas Reynolds

Applicants Present:

Marty Estruch, Hampton Inn
Jim Olverd, Kircher Construction – Hampton Inn
Attorney Jim Coniglio, Underberg & Kessler – Hampton Inn
Robert Recotta, Livingston Lanes – Hampton Inn
David Young, Larson Design Group – Hampton Inn
Corrin Strong, Strong Subdivision

Public Present:

Terry B..., FSB Realty Services, LLC
Linda Poste, 4222 Lakeville Road
Amy Carpenter, 17 Avon Road
Lars Mazzola, 4285 Reservoir Road
Jane Fowler Morse, 4285 Reservoir Road

1. Meeting Opened:

Chair M. Griffo opened the meeting at 4:01PM.

2. Meeting Minutes:

The January 27, 2010 minutes were reviewed. C. Kruppner moved to approve the minutes as presented. D. Farthing seconded the motion and the motion passed with ayes from all.

3. Code Enforcement Office:

January 2010

Building Permit(s)	1
Sign Permit(s)	1
Fire Inspections	2
Rental Housing Permits/Inspections	2

Code Enforcement Officer O'Keefe reported that Code Enforcement Officer Ron Maxwell is recuperating well from his recent knee surgery.

In addition to the 2 fire inspections listed on the report, 2 additional ones were completed. Also, 14 additional rental-housing inspections were completed.

4. Town Planning Board Update:

D. Woods reported that the Town Planning Board meeting was held on Monday, February 8th with the following items on the agenda:

1. Conceptual/Preliminary Review of a Special Use Permit request by Shannon Pinckney for an acupuncture home business at 5132 Route 63. Concept and Preliminary approval were given with a Public Hearing scheduled for March.
2. Site Plan and Special Use Permit Review for Morgan Estates Phase II. Final Approval was given contingent upon the storm water management plan being agreed to by all interested parties.
3. Preliminary Review for Lakeville Estates Phase II, no action was taken.
4. Conceptual and Preliminary approval was given to Todd Cole for a 2-Lot Subdivision on Reservoir Road. A public hearing was scheduled for March.

5. Hampton Inn:

Brief discussion took place regarding the timing of when the Hampton Inn comment letter from MRB Group was completed and sent to the applicant. Engineer DeHollander stated that the letter was generated two days after the work session, February 12th. He has had some phone calls back and forth with Larson Design Group, but has not received a revised set of plans, but believes all issues have been taken care.

The Board was concerned about receiving a revised set of plans this afternoon, and our Engineer not having ample time to review them. Engineer DeHollander agreed that he would be pressed to review them now, but did think the Board should review the comment letter written by him dated February 12, 2010.

6. Other Business:

Secretary Mack stated that according to her records the special use permit granted to Jeremy Lee at 72 North Street for a home chiropractic office will expire on April 22, 2010. The Board agreed that a public hearing should be set for March 24, 2010 at 4:30PM if that is what Mr. Lee wishes to do. Secretary Mack will send a letter to him regarding this.

7. Corrin Strong – Subdivision Request:

Since the January Planning Board meeting, it has been determined that the land Mr. Strong wishes to subdivide is not within an Agricultural District, however, the R-1 Zoning district does allow agriculture uses without a special use permit.

Mr. Strong stated that all he wants to do is remodel the shed into a farm stand and construct a parking lot for the farm stand. However, he does not want customers of the fruit stand using the existing driveway, so a road is proposed along with a two-phase subdivision. The Board wondered if the existing driveway met Village standards for a private road. Engineer DeHollander stated that at the time of the recently approved subdivision for Mr. Strong, the existing driveway did meet the Village standards for a private road. Mr. Strong explained that he has proposed the private driveway wide enough for it to possibly become a public road in the future, but did not know if that was feasible.

At this time, Mr. Strong distributed a revised subdivision plan.

Chair Griffio asked Mr. Strong if he was looking for conceptual approval on Phase I of the proposed subdivision or Phase II. Mr. Strong stated at this time, he is asking for conceptual approval for Phase I, but thought that the Board would not move forward with Phase I unless he included a concept plan for Phase II.

Chair Griffio asked the Board if they were ready to give conceptual approval. D. Woods stated that he thinks that in looking at Phase I, the Board should also consider how both phases are going to look as having two phases affects the layout of lots and access to

them. He also stated that he does not like private drives, as he has seen too many private drives fall back on the municipality.

Code Enforcement Officer O'Keefe wondered if Mr. Strong has had any conversations with New York State Department of Transportation (NYS DOT) regarding two proposed drive-way/road cuts. Mr. Strong stated that he had not but could talk with the resident engineer in their Lakeville office. It was also noted that because NYS DOT will be involved, the New York State Parks Recreation & Historic Preservation department would also be involved.

The Planning Board wondered if the map distributed this afternoon was the latest plan. Mr. Strong said the map is not drawn to scale as he was hoping to get past conceptual review before proceeding with a map drawn to scale.

Engineer DeHollander stated that there were a couple comments from the February 12, 2010 comment letter he would like to address.

Comment #8: Who will own, maintain and ensure that Lot 5 remains as 'reserved for nature conservation'?

Mr. Strong stated that most of the 58 acres that are in Lot 2 are already in a conservation easement with the Genesee Valley Conservancy, therefore, once the exact dimensions are figured out, that parcel will be combined with the large one.

D. Woods stated that his major reservation on granting conceptual approval tonight for this specific layout is that the only access to these lots are off of Avon Road and if there is going to be a Phase II, it makes more sense that the entire subdivision including farm stand parcel and parking lot be served through an interior road.

Further discussion followed and Mr. Strong explained that at the last meeting, four building lots were proposed and now it is down to three and there was an internal road proposed between lots 1 and 4, but after looking at it, thought that it would be cost prohibited. He also noted that at the last meeting, it was mentioned that despite the fact that the Village Code states that cul-de-sacs are acceptable, the DPW does not like them as they cause problems during snow removal, therefore Surveyor Willey, had come up with a turn around type end to the road, instead of a full cul-de-sac and wonders if this is something the Board would consider. Some discussion took place regarding the actual placements of the proposed road cuts, and it was noted that because of the terrain in the area it is not feasible to place them elsewhere.

D. Farthing asked where the front door of the houses would be. Mr. Strong stated that the Avon Road side would be the back of the house and the front doors would most likely be facing west and ideally there will be a strip of land kept as is in the rear of the lots that will be the Avon Road side.

S. Richardson did not have a concern with the road being a private one but not necessarily accessed by Avon Road.

Mr. Strong stated that Phase I should probably be labeled as a 7-lot subdivision, three building lots, the gatehouse, the nature preserve, remaining lands and a farm stand parcel with parking lot.

Discussion followed regarding the shared access drive off of Avon Road and the problems associated with private drives such as maintenance.

D. Farthing wondered if there was space for the proposed road if now private to be brought up to Village standards in the future if it was desired. Mr. Strong believed it would not be cost effective to do this.

Chair Griffo commented that given the area, and only 3 new building lots being proposed, a private drive with easements etc...does not seem to be a problem.

S. Richardson believed that this type of scenario was proposed for a subdivision on Crossett Road.

Mr. Strong asked about the requirement for a Home Owner's Association. Engineer DeHollander stated that as per State requirements any subdivision of 5 or more lots were required to have a Home Owner's Association.

Further discussion followed regarding utilities and NYS DOT site requirements for road cuts. Engineer DeHollander stated that he believes that the information that has been provided is good information, but this subdivision is a fairly complicated one and believes that Mr. Strong should contact a design professional.

Mr. Strong voiced his concern regarding the fact that he knows that the State would have a problem tearing down the pillars to the existing driveway; therefore if he wants to do anything, it must be with road cuts off of Avon Road and he is trying to preserve as much of the existing iron fence as possible.

Chair Griffo asked if the Board would consider granting conceptual approval with the understanding that there will be major hurdles to get over prior to preliminary approval. D. Woods stated that everything is related to everything else and it is hard to separate out, what is in Phase I and what might happen with the rest of the site and the fact of what before us has not been prepared by an engineer, that means, there has been no examination of access, utilities, drainage etc...this may be a case where those details significantly change the layout presented. Attorney Reynolds stated that the main concerns he is hearing from Engineer DeHollander and D. Woods are the two proposed road cuts. Chair Griffo thought that once conceptual approval is given and then none of these details are worked out, preliminary approval could not be granted until they are.

Mr. Strong spoke up and stated that, at this time, he is mainly interested in remodeling that shed into a farm stand and having an access driveway to a parking lot for the farm stand. He would like to have a subdivision, however if there are too many problems at this time would like to at least move forward with the farm stand for this year.

Chair Griffo stated that it does not appear that there is any objection to the farm stand and it is an allowable use, but there is still the issue of the NYS DOT approving a road cut for the parking lot for the farm stand and then the Planning Board is only looking at a 2-lot subdivision.

It was suggested that perhaps when Mr. Strong contacts NYS DOT regarding the road cut for the farm stand and parking area he should also inquire about a second road cut. It was also suggested that Mr. Strong meet with the NYS DOT representative on site. Mr. Strong was agreeable to this.

Mr. Strong stated that he is willing to table his request for a subdivision at this time, if he is at least able to get a building permit to remodel the shed into a farm stand and the farm stand would remain on the lot it currently is located on. CEO O'Keefe stated that his office could not issue a building permit until the Planning Board approves the site plan for the parking lot.

It was agreed that Mr. Strong would meet with a NYS DOT representative and report back to the Village.

8. Hampton Inn:

It was noted that a response or comment letter from MRB Group was written within two days after the work session on the 10th of February and received by the applicant on February 17th. Since then there has been some discussion between MRB Group and Larson Design Group.

David Young of Larson Design group presented the Board, Engineer and Attorney with a revised site plan. Chair Griffo stated that the Board seems somewhat pressed since revised plans were just presented, but stated that the comment letters from MRB Group to Larson Design Group and from Larson Design Group to MRB Group can be looked through and discussed.

MRB Group's comment letter was dated February 12, 2010.

Larson Design Group's response letter was dated February 24, 2010.

MRB Comment #1 A new revised date should be provided on every re-submission. January 11, 2010 was the revision date of the plans reviewed in our January 18, 2010 correspondence.

Larson Response #1 The current plans submitted this afternoon are noted as February 24, 2010 in the revision block on the plans.

MRB Comment #2 A subdivision plan should be provided for review. The plan shall identify all lots involved with the associated subdivision by lot number and acreage. Additionally, the meets and bounds, the existing and proposed easements and neighboring properties should also be indicated on the plan.

Larson Response #2 A subdivision map was provided to the Village months ago. A revised plan from the surveyor will be provided to the Village with the easements on it now and that the size of the pond appears to be set.

The map that was received months ago is not considered a subdivision map.

MRB Comment #3 Easement map and legal descriptions for the proposed dedicated utilities, offsite access areas, and proposed 25' buffer area should be provided to the Village.

Larson Response #3 All proposed easements will be included as part of the revised subdivision plan. It is understood that the plan approval is contingent upon the submittal of the subdivision and easement plan.

D. Woods stated that Engineer DeHollander discussed what type of language should be included on the map regarding the one way access drive out onto Reservoir Road in relationship to the forever wild buffer area and the way it is labeled on the current revised site plan is not acceptable as the buffer does not present itself as continuous. Some discussion continued and it was agreed that this would be removed for further submittals and the buffer would be shown as a continuous one.

MRB Comment #4 According to the plans, it appears that there is a number of offsite work proposed with this application requiring temporary and permanent access easements to be provided. Verify that easements exist from neighboring properties.

Larson Response #4 The Attorney for the developer will be presenting these easements to the Village separately.

MRB Comment #5 It is our understanding that the stormwater management facility will be privately owned and maintained; however, a

- drainage/access easement should be considered to the Village of Geneseo to provide access for inspections of the facility and in the event of an emergency.
- Larson Response #5 This easement is included in the information to be added to the surveyor's plan.
- MRB Comment #6 What is the ultimate disposition of the stormwater runoff discharged from the proposed storm water management facility? What impact, if any, will this have on offsite (downstream) neighboring properties and storm sewer systems? Kindly update the SWPPP, including rating tables for the flow at the NYS Route 20A culvert, and resubmit for our files.
- Larson Response #6 Based on our discussion with Mr. Kurt Rappazzo with MRB, the plans illustrated that the runoff to the area of interest has been reduced in the post development conditions. The SWPPP has been updated to clearly state the impact of the development on neighboring properties and the existing culvert crossing State Route 20A.
- MRB Comment #7 The forebay permanent pool appears to be 2-feet in depth. Per the NYS Stormwater Management Design Manual, this dept should be 4to6-feet.
- Larson Response #7 The pond forebay has been revised to be four feet deep. Please see the grading plan sheet. The forebay bottom elevation is set to elevation 862.5' and the spillway of the forebay is set to elevation 866.5'. The forebay is also designed to hold a minimum of 10% of the water quality volume outfalling into it.
- MRB Comment #8 An aquatic bench is required around the perimeter of the forebay.
- Larson Response #8 Aquatic bench plantings have been provided at elevation 866.5', the normal pool elevation of the forebay as required. Please see the landscape plan.
- MRB Comment #9 The invert of the forebay spillway appears to be above the invert of the inlet pipe. The impact of static water on this pipe's capacity should be considered.
- Larson Response #9 The spillway of the forebay has been set to be half a foot below the invert of the storm outfall pipe. The spillway is set to an invert elevation 866.5' and the outfall pipe is set to an invert elevation 867.0'. Please see the grading plan C-3.
- MRB Comment #10 The micropool appears to be 3 1/2-feet in depth. We recommend this depth be a minimum of 4-feet to reduce the possibility of stagnation.
- Larson Response #10 The micropool elevation has been revised to four feet deep.
- MRB Comment #11 The Standpipe detail should be clarified as to where it is located and how it connects to the outlet structure.

- Larson Response #11 The detail sheet has been updated to show the location of the low flow orifice protection stand pipe on the riser structure detail. The invert elevation of the low flow orifice has also been labeled on the detail. Please see detail sheet D-2.
- MRB Comment #12 Can the berm and emergency spillway be raised such that the invert of the spillway is above the 100-year maximum water surface elevation?
- Larson Response #12 The stormwater pond has been routed twice based on two assumptions. The first assumption is that the principle spillway is functioning and the second assumption is that it is clogged. The emergency spillway has been set at an elevation higher than 100-yr water surface elevation assuming that the principle spillway is functioning. Currently, the pond provides one foot of free board above the elevation of the 100-year surface elevation assuming that the principle spillway is clogged. The emergency spillway design will also safely convey the 100-year water elevation.
- MRB Comment #13 The project is required to provide water quality treatment for all new impervious areas, and those impervious areas that cannot be hydrologically separated. The storm sewer and grading should be revised where possible to meet this requirement.
- Larson Response #13 The storm sewer STM-1 has been revised to discharge into the pond. The amount of impervious outfalling towards route 20A storm system has been reduced to almost half the existing impervious area discharging to route 20A in the pre-development condition.
- MRB Comment #14 An updated Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan reflecting the changes in the SMF and the updated calculations should be submitted for review.
- Larson Response #14 An updated SWPPP has been included with this submission
- MRB Comment #15 The results of the Nationwide Permit #18 application should be forwarded to the Village and this office. Based upon available mapping there are none, but the design engineer should confirm that there are no jurisdictional wetlands within the project area.
- Larson Response #15 The Nationwide culvert permit will be forwarded to the Village upon receipt. Based on soil types, the Kendaia Silt Loam is the only site soils that would be suspect to have wetlands on them. These soils are located in the wooded area where the pond will be constructed. When this area was walked last September, no wetland areas were noted.
- MRB Comment #16 Drawing C-1 shows the 25' "Forever Wild" buffer area a top of the utility easement area along the western property line of the Barber property. Wasn't this buffer area being moved to the west of the easement area to allow for the reserved one-way access to Reservoir Road indicated on drawing C-3?

Larson Response #16

The 25' forever-wild easement has been revised as per advised.

D. Woods stated that the change that has been made from the last version shows the buffer area ending at that easement. Mr. Young stated that he thought that is what the Board had requested. Engineer DeHollander stated that he thought that the buffer area would be continuous and a note made on the plans indicating that if NYS DOT requires an access road in that area in the future, the forever-wild area in that area could be removed.

MRB Comment #17

Can the MH-B design vehicle complete the movement around the rear parking area behind the pool?

MRB Comment #18

Can the MH-B design vehicle navigate the drop off loop? With deliveries being made to the front entrance as indicated by note 19 on drawing C-2, is the MH-B design vehicle the largest vehicle anticipated to use the drop off loop?

Larson Response #17

Larson Response #18

The plans have been revised to show two vehicles in the turning simulation. The first vehicle is a 21-foot van, which is the typical delivery van that is anticipated to load and unload hotel supplies. The second simulation utilized a large 19-foot car towing a 27-foot camper. Such vehicles are not anticipated to use the building entrance area. However, the vehicle can perform a full turn around the proposed parking lot freely. Please see the Site Plan Sheet C-2.

Engineer DeHollander and CEO O'Keefe agreed that emergency vehicles should also be taken into consideration. Engineer DeHollander also asked about larger trucks such as a UPS truck and wondered if it would be able to go under the canopy. Mr. Young stated that he would add this information to the next submittal with an explanation that included emergency vehicles.

MRB Comment #19

The light poles and wiring should be located outside of the Village's water main easement.

Larson Response #19

The light poles and wiring have been relocated outside the proposed water main easement.

MRB Comment #20

The water main easement should be extended over all public hydrants.

Larson Response #20

The water main easement has been extended over all proposed fire hydrants. Please see the utility Plan Sheet C-5.

Engineer DeHollander thought that one of the hydrants originally proposed was going to be removed. Mr. Young stated that yes that had been discussed but not yet revised on these plans. Water/Sewer Superintendent Steve McTarnaghan did not have a problem with this as long as there were no concerns of the Fire Department or Fire Marshal.

MRB Comment #21

The plans should detail the connections between the existing and proposed water systems, and show all proposed service connections, bends, tees, valves and thrust blocks.

Larson Response #21 The connection between the existing and proposed water main has been detailed on the utility Plan Sheet C-5.

It was noted that Water/Sewer Superintendent McTarnaghan had some concerns in regards to the existing line remaining live as the new one is installed. Mr. Young stated that the contractors would work with the Village Water/Sewer department on this matter.

MRB Comment #22 Will the proposed wooden fenceline crossing have any impact to the capacity of the unnamed tributary to Jaycox Creek?

Larson Response #22 The proposed wooden fence will not impact the creek as the bottom of the fence will be set to be at the elevation of the banks of the creek.

MRB Comment #23 The extents of the tree removal in and around the SMF area should be depicted. Tree removal limits will be subject to inspection by the Village Code Enforcement Office.

Larson Response #23 The proposed tree line after disturbing the wooded area where the pond will be constructed has been shown on the grading plan sheet.

The Board had some concern regarding the possible removal trees that were not supposed to be removed. It was recommended that the trees that are not scheduled to be removed should be roped off somehow. CEO O'Keefe stated that some reference points could be looked at now to ensure this.

MRB Comment #24 Topsoil should be stockpiled on site for reclamation in landscaping, lawn, and pond areas. The location of this stockpile should be depicted on the plans with the appropriate erosion controls.

Larson Response #24 Due to site constraints, all topsoil stockpiles and cut material will be transported off site.

Jim Olverd, Kircher Construction stated that all topsoil would be transported to a site in Mount Morris where fill is needed. Engineer DeHollander stated that the concern with this is that the areas that are going to need topsoil on site get it as soon as possible. It was agreed that some topsoil would remain on location and have a silt fence around it.

MRB Comment#25 According to Larson Design Group, the majority of the cut material is being transported to the developer's property at 3068 Route 408, Mount Morris, NY. Does the developer have the necessary permits and erosion control plan to sure and use this material? The SWPPP and NOI should be revised to reflect this additional work area.

Larson Response #25 The SWPPP has been revised to indicate that the soil material taken from the site will be transported and stockpiled at the Developer's property.

MRB Comment #26 The design engineer should consider providing temporary interceptor swales to route offsite runoff around the work area.

Larson Response #26 A temporary interceptor channel may increase the discharger onto neighboring properties. Additional silt fence has been provided at the stream banks to protect the stream from erosion and siltation.

Mr. Young stated that their plan is to construct the pond first; excavating it and getting it stabilized which will allow it to receive any run off from the work area, but if it does become a problem; it will be taken care of on site. It was noted that weekly inspections have been required for this project that will ensure this.

MRB Comment #27 Siltation fencing will need to be provided along the entire length of the Quality Inn parking lot and Route 20-A right-of-way until the upland areas can be stabilized.

Larson Response #27 The erosion and sediment control panel has been revised to show silt fence along the entire length of the Quality Inn.

MRB Comment #28 During installation of the culverts in the unnamed tributary to Jaycox Creek, a temporary ponding area may need to be provided so that base flow can be pumped around the work area.

Larson Response #28 NYSDEC standards and specifications for erosion and sediment control detail for Temporary Culvert crossing, figure 5A.37 will be utilized as a measure of live stream crossing. Please see the Erosion and Sediment Control Sheet C-4.

Chair Griffo asked if the Board had any further questions. D. Woods asked how long it would take for the subdivision plat to be prepared and revise the site plan as discussed today? Chair Griffo was wondering if the Board was uncomfortable making approvals today without those items. D. Woods stated that yes, that was correct, especially because no subdivision plat has been submitted and Engineer DeHollander just saw the revised plans about an hour ago and he should be given the opportunity to look at them in depth at his office. Chair Griffo asked Engineer DeHollander when he thought he could have the review completed. Engineer DeHollander stated that he believed he could have them reviewed by tomorrow afternoon (02/25/2010) and have a comment letter prepared by the end of the week. The Board felt comfortable with this.

Chair Griffo asked if the Board could meet in two days to possibly make a decision. Engineer DeHollander stated that if it were going to happen that quickly, he would skip the formal letter and speak directly to Mr. Young. Attorney Coniglio stated that the only problem he foresees is that in two days, another twenty-eight point comment letter from MRB could be received. Attorney Coniglio went on to state that he believes many of the comments are technical in nature and can be considered building permit issues, not site plan issues. Chair Griffo explained that this is the first time Engineer DeHollander has seen the pond in this configuration but does not foresee any new issues. It was agreed that because of the impending snowstorm western New York is supposed to receive between Thursday and Friday, perhaps the Board should not meet until Monday, March 1, 2010 at 4:30PM. The applicant and the applicant's representatives agreed.

D. Woods stated that he feels compelled to say that any further submissions need to be made at least one business day prior to the meeting. It was noted that one issue still outstanding is the proposed signage that will need to be forwarded to the Zoning Board of Appeals; however, the Planning Board could make a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

S. Richardson asked what the driving force was in relationship to the number of rooms proposed. Attorney Coniglio stated that it is the market.

Mr. Olverd asked if Mr. Recotta could cut back some of the brush that is overgrown in the rear of his building so he could get a lift in there to fix the leaking bowling alley roof. The Board did not have an issue with this. CEO O'Keefe stated that some trees have been cut today but only within the proposed footprint area of the proposed hotel building.

9. Meeting Recess:

With no further business to discuss, S. Richardson moved and C. Kruppner seconded the motion to recess the meeting until Monday, March 1, 2010 at 4:30PM. The motion passed with ayes from all and the meeting adjourned at 6:20PM.

The recessed February 24, 2010 regular Planning Board meeting was reconvened at 4:30PM on Wednesday, March 3, 2010.

Members Present:

Matthew Griffo, Chair
Dori Farthing
Sue Richardson
David Woods
Claren Kruppner

Other Village Representatives Present:

Code Enforcement Officer Dean O'Keefe
MRB | group Engineer Scott DeHollander
Attorney J. Thomas Reynolds

Applicants Present:

Jim Olverd, Kircher Construction – Hampton Inn
Attorney Jim Coniglio, Underberg & Kessler – Hampton Inn
Robert Recotta, Livingston Lanes – Hampton Inn
David Young, Larson Design Group – Hampton Inn

Public Present:

Jane Fowler Morse, 4285 Reservoir Road
Lars Mazzola, 4285 Reservoir Road
Diony Young, 31 Stuyvesant Manor
Fred Barraco

10. Meeting Opened:

Chair Griffo reconvened the February 24, 2010 meeting at 4:30PM. Noting that originally the reconvened meeting was scheduled for Monday, March 1, 2010 at 4:30PM.

11. Hampton Inn continuation:

Chair Griffo stated that at the February 24, 2010 meeting there were a few engineering concerns that needed to be worked out in relationship to the proposed subdivision and site plan for the Hampton Inn.

Engineer DeHollander stated that a revised set of site plans were received and reviewed with only minor technical comments, however, no subdivision plat has been received. Engineer DeHollander stated that he had generated a comment letter dated February 26, 2010 that had been forwarded to the applicant's engineer for review. Chair Griffo asked if MRB's comments have been satisfied. Engineer DeHollander stated that yes he was satisfied but would like to request a set of plans to review prior to a Mylar being prepared.

Chair Griffo asked if Attorney Reynolds is satisfied. Attorney Reynolds stated that he is satisfied and has prepared a draft resolution of approval for the proposed subdivision and site plan. At this time, the resolution was reviewed.

On page #1

The second to last whereas date should be changed to August 24, 2009.

On page #2

The word utilizes in the third finding of fact should be removed.

On page #2

The fourth finding of fact should read as follows: The New York State Department of Transportation has approved the proposed traffic access plan on the condition that the east driveway on the subdivided parcel will be discontinued in the event that a traffic light is installed at Ryan Drive and NYS Route 20A.

On page #3

Condition B: The "Subdivision Plan" should be referred to as "Final Subdivision Plat."

D. Woods had some concerns in relationship to the wording of a note on C-1 that states that the buffer area over the easement may be removed if required by NYSDOT.

D. Woods requested that the language be changed to include that any change in the buffer area needs to come back to the Planning Board for review, specifically the alteration of the buffer area over the 25' easement.

On page #3

It was agreed that condition E should read as follows: No alterations to the premises in deviation from the proposed site plan will occur without Village Planning Board consent, including any alteration to the 25' forever-wild buffer area. This language is to be added to the final site plan Mylar.

CEO O'Keefe added that the actual right-of-way is located in the Town of Geneseo, with the buffer area being located within the Village.

On page #3

Condition A refers to all easements being approved by the Village Engineer and Village Attorney prior to a building permit being issued. Specifically allowing the Hampton Inn and the Village (in the case of an emergency access) to the storm water management pond on the Quality Inn parcel.

D. Woods wondered if the resolution should have some reference to the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Some discussion followed and Engineer DeHollander was concerned about ground cover alteration being made without prior approval, which could negatively impact the storm water management system. It was agreed that an additional condition should be added that states that: *"The site ground cover shall not be changed from the designed conditions without review of the Code Enforcement Officer and proper documentation be provided by the applicant proving that a change to ground cover will not negatively impact the storm water management system."*

S. Richardson inquired about condition C on page #3 regarding the confirmation that no leach fields are currently in use on the original parcel. CEO O'Keefe stated that this has been confirmed by the MEMO received today from Deputy Clerk/Treasurer – Planning Board Secretary Aprile Mack. It was noted that an old hotel to the east of the bowling alley that was demolished several years ago formerly used the leach field.

It was noted that the draft resolution approval year of 2008 had to be changed to reflect the year 2010. All were in agreement that this was correct.

Chair Griffo asked if there any other concerns. Engineer DeHollander stated that two additional conditions should be added to the resolution. One that indicates that prior to

the issuance of the building permit, a letter from the Livingston County Department of Health must be received acknowledging their approval of the 10" water line relocation. The other should indicate that prior to the issuance of the building permit, a copy of the Nation Wide permit from the United States Army Corp. of Engineers be submitted. Attorney Reynolds wondered if timing would be an issue. Mr. Young did not foresee that it would be. Attorney Coniglio did not have a problem with these two conditions being added.

With no further discussion, D. Woods moved the following with second from D. Farthing:

WHEREAS, an application requesting a subdivision for tax parcel 80-10-1-19.1 and an application for site plan approval for a 67 room hotel to be constructed on a portion of said parcel (both hereinafter referred to as the "Applications") has been submitted by Mart Inn, Inc. ("Applicant") and is duly on file in the office of the Village Clerk; and

WHEREAS, under the Village Code, the Planning Board has accepted the application for review in accordance with the provisions of the Village Code and State law; and

WHEREAS, the Village Code Enforcement Officer and Village Engineer have determined that the proposed subdivision and site plan conform to the requirements of the Village Code applicable to this application; and

WHEREAS, the subdivision and site plan approval the ("actions") are actions that are subject to review in accordance with the provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"); and

WHEREAS, the Village Planning Board, as lead agency under SEQRA, conducted a coordinated review of environmental impacts on behalf of all involved agencies, including the Planning Board, and issued a Negative Declaration that the project, including subdivision and site plan development would not have any significant adverse environmental impact; and

WHEREAS, the Applications were referred to the Livingston County Planning Department, which recommended approval thereof with modifications by written determination, dated August 17, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has subsequently revised its subdivision plat and site plan to conform with comments issued by the Village Consulting Engineer and in consideration of recommendations of the Village Planning Board and the Livingston County Planning Department; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the proposed hearing on August 24, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the general public and all interested parties were given a full opportunity to be heard on the proposed actions; and

WHEREAS, the Village Code Enforcement Officer, Village Engineer and Village Attorney have duly considered the comments and have recommended to the Planning Board that the proposed actions conform to the requirements of the Village Code; and

WHEREAS, prior to adopting Resolutions approving the Applications the Planning Board has deemed it necessary to make certain fact findings as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT:

(1) The original parcel is a 7.03 acre parcel occupied by a bowling alley and an out building and the subdivision thereof will result in 1 parcel consisting of 5.120 acres (Lot No. 1) which will be occupied by the Bowling Alley, and a second parcel consisting of 1.964 acres (Lot No. 2) which will be occupied by the proposed hotel. The out building will be removed from the premises.

(2) The parcels are located in the Mixed Use (MU) Zoning District. The hotel and the bowling alley are permitted uses in the MU District.

(3) The proposed site plan and subdivision plat depict utility plans and storm water management plans utilizing lands owned by Geneseo Hospitality, Inc. The plat and site plan both show easements across said Geneseo Hospitality lands as well as cross easements across the subdivided lands to accommodate the aforesaid utilities, storm water management as well as ingress and egress.

(4) The New York State Department of Transportation has approved the proposed traffic access plan on the condition that the east driveway on the subdivided parcel will be discontinued in the event that a traffic light is installed at Ryan Drive and NYS Route 20A.

(5) The site plan contains a buffer of 25 feet, which will be maintained in a forever-wild condition.

(6) The Rochester museum and Science Center conducted a Cultural Resource study on the subject lands and provided a written determination that the proposed development will have no adverse impact on any archeological resources.

(7) By written determination dated February 10, 2010 the Planning Board determined that the development would have no adverse environmental impacts.

(8) The Site Plan and Subdivision Plat have been fully reviewed and compared to the Village Site Plan and Subdivision Regulations and have been determined to be in compliance therewith.

NOW, THEREFORE IT IS HEREBY:

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby approves the Subdivision subject to the conditions set forth hereinafter; and be it also

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby approves the proposed Site Plan subject to the conditions set forth hereinafter; and it is also

RESOLVED, the approval of the Applications is hereby subject to the following conditions:

A. All depicted easements shall be approved by the Village Engineer and the Village Attorney and upon such approval shall be recorded prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

B. The Map of a Survey shall be amended to be referred to as a "Final Subdivision Plat" which needs to include a location map.

C. Confirmation that no leach field(s) are currently in use on the original parcel.

D. To the extent required by the Village Engineer or Village Attorney easements shall also run for the benefit of the Village of Geneseo.

E. No alterations to the premises in deviation from the proposed site plan will occur without Village Planning Board consent, including any alteration to the 25' forever-wild buffer area. This language is to be added to the final site plan Mylar.

F. Compliance with all comments of the Village Engineer effective as of the date hereof.

G. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a letter from the Livingston County Department of Health must be received acknowledging its approval of the 10" water line relocation.

H. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a copy of the Nation Wide permit from the United States Army Corp. of Engineers be submitted.

I. The site ground cover shall not be changed from the designed conditions without review of the Code Enforcement Officer and proper documentation be provided by the

applicant proving that a change to ground cover will not negatively impact the storm water management system; and be it also

RESOLVED, that the Chairman of the Planning Board is authorized to execute any documents appropriate and necessary to implement the intent of this Resolution; and it is also

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board does hereby authorize and direct the Village Clerk to file this Resolution at the earliest possible date.

The motion passed with ayes from all.

Jim Olverd inquired about the recommendation the Planning Board agreed they would send to the Zoning Board of appeals regarding the proposed signage for the Hampton Inn. It was agreed that the Code Office should review any proposed signage prior to the Planning Board receiving it for recommendation.

12. Miscellaneous:

C. Kruppner stated that he would like to see the Planning Board stick to their monthly meeting schedule of the 3rd and 4th Wednesdays. It was not fair to anyone to move the reconvened meeting that was originally scheduled for Monday to today (Wednesday, March 3, 2010.) Chair Griffo agreed but explained that this was an out of the ordinary circumstance that should not happen very often.

13. Meeting Closed:

With no further discussion, S. Richardson moved to close the meeting at 5:22PM with second from C. Kruppner. The motion passed with ayes from all.

Aprile S. Mack, Secretary