

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

Applicants Present:

Andy Hart, Bergmann Associates, ABVI-Goodwill
Joseph J. Istavan, Bergmann Associates, ABVI-Goodwill
Tim Giarrusso, Senior Vice President of Operations
Jeremy & Michelle Lee, Genesee Valley Chiropractic
Dawn Aprile, Aprile Associates, ESL Federal Credit Union
Joseph Burkhart, NPV, Inc., ESL Federal Credit Union
Robert Bringley, Marathon Engineering, ESL Federal Credit Union
Mark Scoville, 42 Court LLC
Kevin VanAllen, Attorney, 42 Court LLC
Robert Topping, Engineer, 42 Court LLC

Public Present:

Anthony Streams, Livonia Senior High, Government Class
Mary Weidner, 74 North Street

1. Meeting Opened:

Chair Griffo opened the meeting at 4:01PM.

2. Code Enforcement Office:

February 2010

Building Permit(s)	4
Operating Permit(s)	1
Rental Housing Permit(s)/Inspection(s)	30

S. Richardson asked for clarification on the building permit issued for 94 Main Street. CEO O’Keefe stated that an office space has been converted to a one-bedroom apartment with a kitchenette, which is an allowable use.

CEO O’Keefe reported that the Town of Geneseo Zoning Board of Appeals approved a new building sign for the north side of the Five Star Bank if they remove one of their pre-existing signs.

3. Town Planning Board Update – David Woods:

D. Woods reported that the Town Planning Board meeting was held on Monday, March 8, 2010 with the following items on the agenda:

1. Public Hearing for Final Approval:

Special Use Permit, Use Class #17 for Shannon Pinckney, for an acupuncture home business at 5132 Route 63.

Approval was granted.

2. Public Hearing for Final Approval:

DePaz (Applicant: Todd Cole) two-lot subdivision, 4286 Reservoir Road.
Conceptual and preliminary approval was granted.

3. Site Plan Review:

Lakeville Estates, Phase II

D. Woods stated that he has been asked by the Town Planning Board to report on Village Planning Board activities.

4. Sign Permit(s):

CEO O'Keefe requested that the Planning Board review the sign application for Frugal Fashionista located at 61 Main Street. D. Woods stated that he thought that the sign's colors and design was in the spirit of the signs the Planning Board would like to see in the Village. With no further discussion, S. Richardson moved to approve the sign permit as presented. D. Woods seconded the motion. It was noted that they would not be requesting a sign grant. The motion passed with ayes from all.

5. Mark Scoville – 137 Center Street – Bar/tavern/Restaurant:

CEO O'Keefe stated that Mr. Scoville wishes to add a handicap ramp to the entrance, to expand the deck and to make the existing bay window facing Route 20A the ADA entrance to the bar/tavern/restaurant. Board approval is needed because they are changing the footprint of the tavern by approximately 500 square feet. The ADA ramp does not need Board approval because it is required for ADA compliancy. The deck will be perhaps big enough for only a table. The railing will match the existing railing and the deck will be in compliance with all Village setbacks. C. Kruppner moved to amend the previous site plan and special use permit approval to increase the deck by approximately 500 feet. S. Richardson seconded the motion and the motion passed with ayes from all.

6. ABVI Goodwill – Livingston Plaza – Lakeville Road:

Andy Hart, Bergmann associates presented a plan for an ABVI-goodwill store with donation drop-off area in the Livingston Plaza on Lakeville Road between the Grossman's Bargain outlet store and former Tractor Supply store. The plan is to add two sets of double doors, one set for the main entrance into the store and the other set for the drop off entrance. Some of the existing pillars that support the canopy will have to be replaced to allow for the two sets of doors.

At this time, Mr. Hart, distributed changes to the elevation of the building, which have not yet been shared with MRB Group Engineer DeHollander until now. The new supports for the canopy will no longer be brick and the canopy will extend beyond the sidewalk. They wish to extend it approximately two feet beyond the existing canopy just in the entrance area. At the donation canopy there will be a four-foot addition that will be cantilevered over the drop-off area. There will be no pillars supporting that portion of the canopy. The canopy will be approximately thirteen feet above the sidewalk.

They also wish to replace the rear elevation and will do so by building ramps to deal with the difference in elevation. They will also add cement at the loading dock area to help deal with grade change. They will also clean up drains that are at the back of the building to help with runoff. Engineer DeHollander asked that ABVI provide turning radius info for the space in the rear of the building. The Board asked what type of delivery traffic they expect. Mr. Hart stated that the trucks will be typically forty-foot tractor-trailers but they will also have some smaller truck deliveries.

The Board asked if there would be a dumpster. Mr. Hart stated that they hope to have a dumpster off the side of the loading dock. If there is space at the rear of the building, they will set it up so that employees can walk out of the back of the building and easily throw items into the dumpster from the loading dock level. At this time, ABVI-Goodwill does not have plans to enclose the dumpsters at the back of the building. S. Richardson asked if there was a need for an enclosure of the dumpster. Chair Griffo stated that an enclosure wouldn't necessarily be needed as no other tenants in this building have one and the dumpsters are not seen from the road. Engineer DeHollander felt that the board had discretion regarding the need for an enclosure. D. Woods stated that the dumpsters might not be visible from Route 20A/Lakeville Road, but that they are from Megan Drive to the north of this building. Mr. Giarrusso wondered if the Board would be requesting the remainder of the tenants in the building to enclose their dumpsters. The Board agreed that when they came in for a change of some type or as new tenants came in; they would be requesting them to enclose their dumpsters. Mr. Giarrusso asked what type of enclosure the Board was looking for as they are trying to keep their costs down as much as possible. The Board agreed that they would be looking for something with bollards and wood slats, similar to what has been done at the Shoe Dept./Maurice building on Veteran Drive.

It was noted that Engineer DeHollander in his March 15, 2010 comment letter asked if this application proposed to remove the outside equipment storage area associated with the previous use of this site. CEO O'Keefe stated that Tractor Supply used the storage area; ABVI-Goodwill will actually be leasing the space between for the former Tractor Supply store and Grossman's bargain outlet. However, CEO O'Keefe stated that he has contacted the maintenance man for the plaza who will be speaking with the owner's to see if that storage area can be removed.

Chair Griffo opened the Jeremy Lee, 72 North Street public hearing at 4:34pm.

Discussion followed regarding the requested signage for ABVI-Goodwill. At this time, they are proposing three separate backlit signs approximately 120 total square feet:

1. Smiling G box sign (their logo)
2. Goodwill (in letters)
3. Donation Drop-Off box sign

Chair Griffo asked what the total frontage of their section of the plaza was. Mr. Hart stated that it is 113 feet. CEO O'Keefe stated that he believes they are only allowed up to 100 square feet of signage even if their frontage is over that. D. Farthing asked what time the store would be open to. Mr. Giarrusso stated that the store will be open until 9PM and wondered if the sign light would need to be turned off at a certain hour as other towns and villages require that. Chair Griffo stated that there was no specific time but stated that personally he would like to see the sign off by 11PM. D. Farthing wondered if this would be a problem in relationship to items being dropped off when the store was not open. Chair Griffo asked if they would be requesting a variance for the total square footage. CEO O'Keefe stated that they would also need a variance for the number of signs as they are only allowed one wall sign per business. The Board suggested that they try to downsize their signs somehow so they are only requesting one variance instead of two. Mr. Giarrusso wondered why they should consider downsizing when they have to request one variance anyway. Chair Griffo stated that there is brand new zoning in place and it has become very difficult to deviate from that. Chair Griffo stated that normally the Planning Board encourages dimensional signs, but this entire plaza's current signs are backlit.

Mr. Hart stated that at this time they are also proposing a temporary drop off structure to allow people to start donating now. It is a pre-manufactured storage structure with bank like drop down boxes. Once the store is opened, the structure would be removed. Mr. Giarrusso stated that it fits in one parking spot. Engineer DeHollander wondered if it would require a special use permit. The Board believed it would be exempt, noting Section 130-54 A. (2) of the Village Code that states: *Outdoor storage of materials and equipment. No material of any kind shall be stored outdoors in any zoning district, except a one- or two- family lot, unless: used in the construction or alteration of a structure on the same lot or in the same development and stored for not more than one year or not more than 60 days after completion of construction, whichever is less.* C. Kruppner wondered if it would have a name on it. Mr. Giarrusso stated that it would have a "G" on it. S. Richardson asked how often it would be checked. Mr. Giarrusso stated that they hope to have an attendant on duty during normal business hours, but they are also collaborating with the ARC of Livingston County and Chances and Changes regarding any large donation items they may receive. Mr. Giarrusso stated that they hope to be open by August 15th; therefore the temporary storage structure would be removed approximately at that time.

CEO O'Keefe wondered if in the Board's opinion if the unanswered items could be worked out in contingencies. Engineer DeHollander stated that his concerns are more technical in nature, so it would not matter to him if the Board decided to grant final approval tonight with those contingencies.

With no further discussion, S. Richardson moved to grant preliminary site plan approval for ABVI-Goodwill. D. Farthing seconded the motion and the motion passed with ayes from all.

C. Kruppner moved to wave a site plan public hearing for ABVI-Goodwill. D. Woods seconded the motion and the motion passed with ayes from all.

At this time, the State Environmental Quality Review short form was reviewed.

Part I - Project Information

#6 Describe Project Briefly:

ABVI-Goodwill is leasing 26,000 square feet of existing retail space within the Livingston Plaza. They would like to make renovations to the front façade of the building to include a new entry canopy and new drop off canopy. They would also like to enclose a portion of the existing loading platform in the rear of the building to accommodate loading. Dimensions are 14' X 29' = 406 square feet.

The Board and Applicant agreed that the last two sentences of the description of the project could be crossed out, as they will not be enclosing the existing loading platform in the rear. D. Farthing wondered if the description of the project needed to include the façade extensions. D. Woods stated that it did not matter.

***Chair Griffo asked without objection if the
Jeremy Lee, 72 North Street public hearing could be extended.
There were no objections.***

With no further discussion, D. Woods moved that the ABVI-Goodwill 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 and the motion passed with ayes from all.

With no further discussion, D. Farthing moved to grant final site plan approval for ABVI-Goodwill with the following contingencies:

1. Dumpster enclosure rendering submitted for approval and added to the site plan.
2. Updated proposed signage submitted for review and variance as needed.
3. Coordination with Village Engineer, on truck traffic turning radius needed at rear of building.

S. Richardson seconded the motion and the motion passed with ayes from all.

7. Public Hearing Continuation:

Dr. Jeremy Lee – 72 North Street – Special Use Permit Renewal Request - Home Chiropractic Office:

Chair Griffo asked if there were any questions or comments from the public regarding Dr. Lee's request. Mrs. Weidner, neighbor to Dr. and Mrs. Lee stated that everything is fine. Chair Griffo in his personal opinion stated that the improvements Dr. and Mrs. Lee have made to the property have been great. C. Kruppner agreed.

With no further discussion, D. Farthing moved to close the public hearing at 5:08PM. S. Richardson seconded the motion. The motion passed with ayes from all.

With no further discussion, D. Farthing moved to grant Dr. Jeremy Lee a permanent special use permit for a home chiropractic office at 72 North Street, with the understanding that if the property is sold, the permanent special use permit will be automatically revoked. C. Kruppner seconded the motion and the motion passed with ayes from all.

8. Aprile Associates/ESL Federal Credit Union – Subdivision & Site Plan Review:

Robert Bringley, Marathon Engineering explained that ESL Federal Credit Union is proposing to open an approximately 5700 square foot federal credit union on Ryan Drive. The entire area will tie into the existing stormwater management plan that originally included this lot when the Wal*Mart Supercenter was built.

Mr. Bringley stated that they had received Engineer DeHollander's comment letter and distributed a response letter to the Board and Engineer DeHollander, he continued by stating that they did not have any serious concerns with the comments that were made. However, they would like to discuss Engineer DeHollander's comment #6 from his letter dated March 16, 2010:

MRB Group previously commented on a concern with the proposed two access point locations and general site configuration. The applicant has proceeded with the original concept plan layout. The Planning Board should determine whether or not two (2) access points onto Ryan Drive from this parcel is warranted. Based on our review, the northerly access point creates a potential conflict with vehicle parking movements fronting the proposed building. Accordingly, due to the close proximity to the Ryan Drive/Veteran Drive intersection, we are concerned with Ryan Drive traffic queuing and stacking conflicts.

Mr. Bringley explained that the northern access drive serves those that are actually going to come into the branch building, and the southern access drive is for those using the ATM/auto teller. ESL prefers to keep these two functions separate from each other, which have worked out at other ESL branches. Mr. Bringley however stated that they are proposing a cross access between the ESL lot and the subdivided out lot, which was a request the Board had, therefore eliminating at least one more road cut onto the east side of Ryan Drive.

Engineer DeHollander commented that the response provided for this comment is lacking in that it is not quantified. Engineer DeHollander stated that he is specifically

looking for traffic counts at peak hours and how this specific access will work with the peak hours of the intersection. Ms. Aprile stated that several traffic studies have been completed for this area including a post Wal*Mart supercenter traffic study completed in 2006-2007. Engineer DeHollander asked that this study and any other studies be submitted for review.

Mr. Bringley stated that the elevation design proposed is a corporate design. They are aware that the signs that they were proposing may not have met Village Code, therefore, they are prepared to meet the code with square footage, which will be submitted with the proposed final site plan map.

S. Richardson stated that she is concerned with traffic flow coming into the lot to use the ATM/auto teller facility. Mr. Joe Burkhart, NPV, Inc. stated that this style is a new prototype, however, with two ATM's and two auto tellers it works well.

The Board asked about the parking lot lighting reminding them that it must be dark sky compliant per Village Code requirements. Mr. Bringley stated that he was aware of this and all proposed lighting is dark sky compliant on either eighteen-foot or sixteen-foot poles. He explained that the more intense lighting is around the ATM/auto tellers and have to meet the ATM Lighting Act. Chair Griffo stated that the Board is very understanding of this but he has seen ATM lights on top of buildings, shining into oncoming traffic and spilling onto other properties. Mr. Bringley explained that they are not proposing any lighting on the roof and the lighting under the ATM/auto teller's canopy will be recessed.

Mr. Burkhart stated that two lights would also be installed on the face of the ATM's that provide light for the hidden cameras.

Chair Griffo asked where the HVAC (Heating Ventilation Air Conditioning) units would be placed. Mr. Burkhart stated that three low profile units would be installed on the roof below the parapet, behind the gable. Chair Griffo stated that the Board prefers that they not be seen at all and there was some concern that they might be visible from Veteran Drive and/or Volunteer Road. It was agreed that an elevation plan from Veteran Drive and Volunteer Road were needed.

The Board asked if they would be disturbing the historic cemetery just to the east of this property. Dawn Aprile, Aprile Associates stated that an archeological study was completed in the early stages of the subdivision of the overall large parcel and no artifacts were found.

At this time, the grading plan was reviewed and Engineer DeHollander noted that the grass area would drain towards the parking lot.

S. Richardson was concerned with pedestrian access to the site as there is a sidewalk on the west side of Ryan Drive, but there is not one on the east side. The Board agreed that perhaps a sidewalk was not needed but a sidewalk easement should be put in place for a future one. The Board also agreed that DPW Streets Superintendent Jason Frazier should review the plan especially in regards to where a possible crosswalk could be placed so pedestrians could access the site.

With no further discussion, D. Farthing moved to approve sketch plat approval for a two-lot subdivision. S. Richardson seconded the motion and the motion passed with ayes from all.

At this time, the proposed signage was reviewed. CEO O'Keefe stated that because this lot is a corner lot, ESL is allowed a sign on each street side not exceeding one square foot for each linear foot of width of the front of the wall, total to not exceed 100 square feet. Mr. Burkhart stated that they believe they are within Code. Chair Griffo asked if the proposed signage is internally lit. Mr. Burkhart stated that the sign does have LED lights, with a blue transparent panel with the white letters/design cut out of it.

The Board inquired about ATM signage. Mr. Burkhart stated there are only directional signs for the ATM and auto tellers, which are allowable per code.

Further discussion followed regarding the need for a SEQRA review. Ms. Aprile stated that the SEQRA was completed in 2005, and it included a bank. D. Woods asked that all of that information along with the archeological study be submitted for review. It was suggested that perhaps a short SEQRA form should be submitted for review.

With no further discussion, D. Woods moved to approve preliminary subdivision approval for a two-lot subdivision and preliminary site plan approval for an ESL Federal Credit Union on Ryan Drive. C. Kruppner seconded the motion and the motion passed with ayes from all.

At this time the matter of whether or not a public hearing should be scheduled prior to final approval was discussed. Ms. Aprile stated that CEO Maxwell had mentioned that perhaps a public hearing was not needed. The Board was unsure as to why CEO Maxwell might have stated this; therefore, they would be looking into it further and would get back to the ESL representatives.

9. 42 Court LLC – Mark Scoville – Site Plan Review:

Two-Story Eight-Unit Apartment Building, Court Street:

Mark Scoville appeared before the Board with his Engineer Robert Topping of Topping Engineering. Mr. Scoville was somewhat concerned about the twenty-five point comment letter he had received from Engineer DeHollander and hoped that this would be the last comment letter from him. Mr. Topping stated that most of the comments made were not engineering comments but construction comments. Chair Griffo asked if the plan had changed from the previous submittal. Mr. Scoville said that it had based on Engineer DeHollander's last comment letter.

At this time, Engineer DeHollander's March 15, 2010 comment letter was reviewed.

1. As a point of clarification this application includes the re-subdivision of the Scorsone parcel (.863 acres) and the Scoville parcel (1.256 acres) into a single 2.119-acre parcel.

Mr. Topping stated that as shown on the map, the parcels have been already combined. Engineer DeHollander stated that from the plan he reviewed, it was not clear to him whether or not they had been combined.

2. If the existing frame house (#48) is proposed to remain will it have a "Commercial" use? Occupancy other than "Dwelling" requires a Special Use Permit according to Attachment 130-132 Bulk and Use table of the Zoning Code. The applicant should explain the intent.

Mr. Scoville stated that the residential house would remain as is.

3. It appears that a 15' side setback is required by Attachment 130-132 Bulk and Use table of the Zoning Code. The proposed application proposes a 10' side setback.

Mr. Topping wondered if there had been a change in zoning from Mr. Scoville's first submittal. CEO O'Keefe stated that he believed the previous zoning regulations also requested a 15' minimum setback. Mr. Scoville stated that he would either apply for a variance or move it back to allow for the 15'.

4. A maximum building height of 35' is allowed in the R-3 zoning district. The proposed building elevations do not include a total height dimension.

Mr. Topping stated that the building is approximately 30' in height.

5. Vehicle turning movements demonstrating that there is adequate space available for delivery, disposal, emergency and vehicles with trailers (boats, lawn and garden supplies, etc...) to maneuver around onsite without obstructing the internal traffic flow should be provided.

Mr. Topping stated that the proposed units are student rentals and he does not foresee many vehicles with trailers needing to maneuver in the parking lot. The Board understood this but noted that emergency vehicles needed to be considered along with the vehicles that might be used to move tenants in and out each year. Mr. Scoville stated that if need be he believes they could cut back on parking spaces to allow for proper turning radiuses. It was agreed that a design vehicle would be chosen and turning radiuses would be added to the site plan.

The Board asked if the driveway would be paved or graveled. Mr. Scoville stated that it depended on what was required. Engineer DeHollander stated that it has been proposed as asphalt if they were to use gravel instead that would create a whole different situation that has not been considered. Also, if paved the driveway/parking lot would need to be striped.

The Board asked if Mr. Scoville has found that his tenants have fewer cars then they have had in the past. Mr. Scoville stated that most of his tenants are from New York City and do not have vehicles.

6. A note should be added to the plans stating, "All fire lanes to the building are required to remain unobstructed at all times to allow for emergency vehicle/fire apparatus to access the site and building."

Mr. Scoville did not have a problem with this.

7. Are additional dumpsters anticipated to be provided for the proposed apartment complex?

Mr. Scoville stated that it will remain as is and he has no plans to add an additional one. D. Farthing asked if the existing dumpster was enclosed. Mr. Scoville stated that it was not. D. Farthing wondered if it should be, as the Board has required it for ABVI-Goodwill and many other projects within the Village. Chair Griffo asked the Board to consider the location of the proposal especially since the dumpster location is off the road out of public view and with the understanding that the other dumpster enclosures the Board has required are in commercial not residential districts. Mr. Scoville asked the Board to not compare his proposal to a Hampton Inn or ESL Federal Credit Union. D. Farthing understood this but explained that it would help with aesthetics and stated that the tenants and tenant's parents might appreciate seeing an enclosed dumpster. Chair Griffo encouraged all Planning Board members to visit the site. Mr. Scoville stated that he really did not have a concern with enclosing the dumpster as long as Waste Management did not have an issue with it. Mr. Scoville's Attorney KevinVanAllen wondered if the Board would be asking other rental property owner's to enclose their dumpsters. The Board believed that if there was some type of Planning Board request made by a rental property owner and they had a dumpster the Board would request a dumpster enclosure. C. Kruppner was wondered if only one dumpster would be enough to accommodate another eight unit apartment building. Mr. Scoville stated that it should large enough but that he would request two pick-ups a week instead of one.

8. The width of the proposed sidewalk should be labeled on the plans.

Mr. Topping stated that he would add this to the next submittal.

9. The plans indicate that a connection to the existing apartment 1-1/2" water service is to be made to serve the new building. The applicant should provide hydraulic calculations supporting this configuration for domestic and fire protection for review.

Mr. Topping stated that the calculations would be submitted with the final plan.

10. The proposed and existing backflow preventer and water meter locations should be provided on the plans.

Mr. Topping stated that they would be added to the final plan.

11. The building fire apparatus access appears to be in excess of the maximum allowable by NYS fire code. Is a fire hydrant required?

Mr. Scoville believed he was in compliance with all Fire Codes. However, CEO O'Keefe stated that he would be reviewing the plans per the Fire Code in the near future.

12. The location of the municipal watermain, and the nearest fire hydrant should be shown on the site plans. Additionally, the design engineer should provide fire flow data for these hydrants.

CEO O'Keefe stated that the Water Department should be able to provide Mr. Scoville with this information.

13. A sanitary sewer cleanout is to be provided along the proposed lateral ROW and another at the building connection.

Mr. Scoville did not have a problem with this.

14. All drainage runoff produced by the proposed site improvements should be captured onsite and redirected away from building foundations and neighboring properties.

15. The applicant must calculate the capacity of the receiving 12' storm sewer. If insufficient capacity exists, mitigation devised must be provided. Increases of overland runoff to the adjacent parcels (ie: area 3) is strongly discouraged.

Mr. Topping commented that he did not believe Engineer DeHollander reviewed the drainage report, which was provided and believed there would be less runoff than there was before. Engineer DeHollander stated that the information for area three was not provided. Mr. Topping was concerned as to why Engineer DeHollander wanted his applicant to calculate the above stated information. Engineer DeHollander explained that if the applicant will be adding to it then the applicant should provide those calculations. Mr. Topping wondered if the Village would have those calculations. It was suggested that Mr. Topping contact the Water/Sewer department.

16. What is the ultimate disposition of the stormwater runoff discharged from the proposed site? What impact, if any, will this have on offsite (downstream) neighboring properties and storm sewer systems?

Mr. Topping stated that he believes it will reduce what is going on. Engineer DeHollander stated that that information needs to be quantified.

17. A detailed construction sequence outlining the individual steps taken during construction shall be proved on the plans to ensure that erosion and sediment control measures will be provided.

18. A detailed construction sequence outlining the individual steps taken during construction should be provided.

19. A staging area for equipment storage, materials and employee parking should be shown on the plans. How will construction affect access to the other sites and the tenants of the existing apartments?

Mr. Topping stated that these are all construction details that will be placed on the building plans, not the site plan. Engineer DeHollander explained that a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is routinely shown on a site plan and is a requirement of New York State. Engineer DeHollander continued by stating that design guidelines should be available through NYS DEC.

20. A stabilized construction entrance and a concrete truck washing area should be depicted on the plans to prevent sediment, concrete and other materials from being deposited onto Court Street.

Mr. Scoville wondered why they couldn't just use the existing parking lot. Mr. Topping stated that a concrete washing area on site was not a requirement of NYS. Engineer DeHollander explained that all construction vehicle tires need to be cleaned on site prior to entering back onto Court Street. This requirement and the stabilization entrance is a local Code requirement. Chair Griffo wondered how the Village monitored these types of things. CEO O'Keefe stated that he believes mainly by complaint.

21. According to the plans, in some areas along the northern boundary line, grading and the installation of silt fencing will take place offsite. Therefore, temporary access easements should be provided identifying these limits should be added to the plans.

The Board agreed that they would need something on file stating that this was okay with the neighboring property owners.

22. The total acreage of disturbance and proposed clearing limits should be labeled on the plans. A note stating that orange construction fencing will be provided identifying these limits should be added to the plans.

Engineer DeHollander explained that an element like this would be included in an erosion control plan. Further discussion followed and Mr. Topping agreed to add the information to the plans.

23. Designer cut-sheets of the pole based models and building fixtures are required for the Village's review. All lighting shall be directed toward and illuminate the site only and shall not intrude or trespass upon any adjacent properties. Additionally, a note is to be added to the plans stating that all lighting is to be "dark sky" compliant.

Chair Griffo asked if any light poles would be added. Mr. Topping stated that yes and some existing poles would need to be relocated. Engineer DeHollander reminded the Board that a photometric plot would need to be provided for review. Mr. Scoville stated that he would provide that information. The code states that there must not be any spillage of light beyond any property line.

24. A landscaping plan for the site and proposed building should be considered. A landscaping schedule identifying the number, type and size should be included. Additionally, tree and shrub planting details would be required.

Mr. Scoville stated that traditionally he has planted rose bushes along the front of the buildings and used stone along the buildings instead of mulch and that is what is planned

this time. The Board did not see a problem with this but that any landscaping plans need to be added to the plan. Mr. Scoville did not have a problem with this.

25. The following details should be provided on the plans:

- **Sanitary cleanout detail (Appendix B)**
- **Storm & Sanitary service lateral detail (Appendix C)**
- **Storm sewer manhole & catch basin manhole (Appendix G)**
- **Catch Basin Detail (Appendix H)**
- **Water service detail (Appendix N)**
- **Pavement cross sections (Appendix T)**
- **Sidewalk detail (Appendix X)**

Mr. Scoville did not have an issue with adding these items to the plan.

Mr. Scoville continued by stating that he was very concerned about receiving another twenty-five point comment letter from Engineer DeHollander. Engineer DeHollander stated that he has finished his preliminary review of the project and does not expect any further issues to come up, however, if the building is moved, that may drive additional comments.

At this time, the Board agreed to set a site plan public hearing for this proposal for Wednesday, April 28th.

10. Meeting Closed:

With no further discussion, D. Farthing moved to close the meeting at 6:41PM with second from D. Woods. The motion passed with ayes from all.

Aprile S. Mack, Secretary