

VILLAGE OF HONEOYE FALLS PLANNING BOARD

May 5, 2002

MEMBERS PRESENT: Denise Heischman, Chair
John Hoffman
Earll Fontaine
Tom Judd
Betsy Taylor

ALSO PRESENT: Michael Tobin, Village Attorney; James Turner, Village Code Enforcement Officer; Greg Emerson, Village DPW Superintendent; Michael Schaffron , Village Engineer; Gerald Semmel; Mike & Sandra Leavy; Scott Shaw, Conifer Development; Norbert Hausner, NH Architecture; Michael Sponable, MRB Group; George Kaleh; Robert Kieffer, FRA Associates; John Augsut, David Dworkin, Monroe Village Associates; Jerry Goldman, Fix Spindleman & Brovitz; Gary Smith, Parrone Associates; Jim Durfee, Architect; concerned citizens from Totiakton.

Chairman Heischman called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:30 p.m.

SITE PLAN REVIEW : NEW HOME : CLOVER MEADOWS LOT # 37: ROSEN

The Board reviewed plans for a new home, a "Applebee" model previously approved for other sites. Mr. Rosen noted that the odd shaped lot lent itself to a side-load garage. The Board reviewed locations of the nearest "Applebee" models in the development.

Motion by Earll Fontaine, seconded by Betsy Taylor to grant site plan approval to Richard Rosen for a new home to be built at Lot # 37 Clover Meadows, pursuant to plans submitted.

Motion carried.

SITE PLAN REVIEW : NEW HOME: CLOVER MEADOWS LOT # 27/ 8 BRIGHAM CIRCLE: ROSEN

The Board reviewed plans for a new home to be built , a "Morgan" model. This model has been approved at previous sites. Mr. Rosen noted the triangular shaped lot, and described design features. A brick chimney was noted. Mr. Rosen stated that there was a "Morgan " model built nearby to the proposed home, but that the houses would be oriented away from each other. Ms. Taylor expressed concern that the two houses would be similar in color. Mr. Rosen stated that the proposed house could be painted a different color.

Motion by Betsy Taylor, seconded by John Hoffman to grant site plan approval to Richard Rosen, for a new home to be built at Clover Meadows Lot# 27 pursuant to plans received, with the contingency that the house be painted a different color than the nearest "Morgan" model.

Motion Carried.

SITE PLAN REVIEW : NEW HOME : CLOVER MEADOWS LOT #1/ 2 PRIDE STREET: ROSEN

The Board discussed the lot, the first lot to the development on Pride Street. Mr. Judd reminded Mr. Rosen that the fence and sign would have to be removed when the last house in the development was completed.

The Board reviewed the design and elevation drawings of the house. He noted that the 4" trim had been changed to shuttered windows all around the house. No setback issues were noted. Mr. Rosen noted that respacing of the side windows would be necessary for accomodation of the shutters, which was not illustrated on the plans. There were no objections to this amendment.

Motion by Betsy Taylor, seconded by John Hoffman to grant site plan approval to Richard Rosen for a new home to be built at Lot #1 Clover Meadows, 2 Pride Street, pursuant to plans received and amended at the meeting to allow for respacing of side windows to allow for the accomodation of shutters.

Motion carried.

**CON'T. PUBLIC HEARING: SITE PLAN REVIEW : GARAGE ADDITION : 124
MONROE STREET : SEMMEL**

The Board resumed the public hearing left open from last month's meeting for site plan review for a garage addition.

Mr. Semmel stated that he had received an area variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals as requested by the Planning Board. The Board reviewed the survey map submitted, as well as the revised drawings showing windows and roof pitch as requested. Mr. Semmel noted that the new windows would match those existing on the garage.

Chairman Heischman inquired if there were any comments form the assembled regarding the application. As none were noted, the public hearing was closed at 7:58 p.m.

ACTION ON THE PUBLIC HEARING ITEM

Motion by John Hoffman, seconded by Earll Fontaine to grant site plan approval to Gerald Semmel for an addition to his 124 Monroe Street garage, pursuant to plans received.

Motion carried.

SITE PLAN REVISIONS : NEW HOME : HYDE PARK SUBDIVISION LOT # 4 : LEAVY

Mr. and Mrs. Leavy approached the Board with revisions to site plans that had been previously approved by the Board. Revisions to the form of the house, including the front door and garage door were noted.

Mr. Turner stated that the site plan approval had expired and new approvals would be needed. Chairman Heischman stated that the Leavys would not need to provide a SEQR with their new submission. Chairman Heischamn requested that the Leavys provide a separate drawing of the trim to be used around the door. Chairman Heischman informed the Leavys that a public hearing would be scheduled for the June 3, 2002 meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING : SITE PLAN REVIEW: CAMERON COURT APARTMENT PROJECT :
PINE TRAIL : CONIFER DEVELOPMENT**

Chairman Heischman opened the public hearing at 8:18 p.m.

Scott Shaw, Conifer Development, Mike Sponable, MRB Group and Norbert Hausner, architect approached the Board to review plans for a proposed low-income housing complex. Mr. Shaw described the complex as consisting of a two-story, L-shaped 40- unit building. Mr. Shaw stated that the development would be termed a general population housing project, but expected that senior citizens would comprise the bulk of the population. Chairman Heischman inquired as to tenant selection criteria. Mr. Shaw stated that credit and police checks would be used, and that maximum income requirements for tenancy could not exceed \$24,000 per year. Mr. Shaw stated that the project was in the process of seeking funding through the USDA Rural Development initiative. Mr. Hoffman questioned Mr. Shaw if the income guidelines were to be indexed; Mr. Shaw stated that if median income levels rose, that would affect the formula for determining maximum income levels for tenancy.

Mr. Hausner presented plans to the board showing the L-shaped building, designed to avoid a large, unbroken façade, and to accommodate an unusually-shaped lot. Chairman Heischman noted the dropoff

entrance to the complex; Mr. Hausner stated it would be used as a main entrance, for elderly tenant or visitor drop-off, and for postal and package deliveries. Mr. Hoffman inquired what would be done with the vacant area of the lot ; Mr. Hausner stated that it would be undeveloped, with “passive vegetation” or “forever wild”. Mr. Hausner noted that the building had been slid back as far as it could to accommodate a dumpster enclosure without encroaching on the side setback. Mr., Hausner inquired if the dumpster enclosure would need a permit for an accessory structure; he was told it would not.

The Board reviewed floor plans for the project. Features noted by the Board included: a covered porch; vestibule; community lounge; laundry room; storage areas and a patio. Chairman Heischman inquired as to the size of the porches; Mr. Hausner stated they would be 8'x7'. Mr. Hausner stated there would be 2 laundry facilities, with a total of 8 washers and dryers. The Board also reviewed doors, exits, lounges, mechanical room, and an elevator to the second floor shown on the plans.

Next reviewed were elevation drawings. The Board noted the building would have shutters and trimmed windows, porches, end gables, and board-and-batten siding. The roofing would be architectural grade shingles; the Board also reviewed roof elevations.

Parking configurations were reviewed. A discussion ensued regarding the parking lot location, in the front of the building, which is prohibited by Village Code. Mr. Shaw stated that parking was configured in this way to avoid a long rectangular building Chairman Heischman stated she felt there was too much unbroken blacktop in the plans submitted, and stated she would prefer the area to be broken up by landscaping or other measures. Measures such as land banking, use of a median and screening with trees were discussed. The use of berms for screening was also discussed. Mr. Shaw stated that there would be no storage of trailers, RVs or boats in the parking lot. Mr. Schaffron, Village Engineer, stated that a traffic study from Monroe County would not be required for this project.

Interior floor plans were reviewed. Mr. Hausner stated all apartments would be accessed through interior hallways. Siding and lighting were also discussed. Mr. Hausner stated clapboard siding would be used. Mr. Tobin stated the following items needed to be addressed: environmental issues; the height of the building; the percentage of building to lot size and the parking configuration. Mr. Tobin stated that 5,445 square feet would be required for the number of apartments requested., and that parking should be to the rear or side of the building. Mr. Hausner stated that options such as a zoning variance or land banking would be explored in regards to the parking situation, but that the L-shaped building layout with parking in the rear was employed to avoid a long rectangular building. The process for a zoning variance was discussed.

Next discussed were drainage issues. Mr. Shaw stated that this project would help to alleviate some of the draining problems in the area. Mr. Shaw stated that they were working with the Pinebrooke apartment project to develop improved drainage in the area . Mr. Schaffron noted that plans showed the stormwater detention project combining with that of Pinebrooke and draining across the old railroad bed. Mr. Shaw stated that the stormline would be extended and would drain into the West Main Street storm sewers. Mr. Schaffron asked where the detention structures would be located; Mr. Hausner replied that the engineering work was not completed at this point. Mr. Tobin stated that a long form EAF should be filed by the applicants. Mr. Robert Keiffer, FRA Engineering, stated that he would be working with Conifer to assist in mitigating the drainage problems in the area.

The applicants were instructed to return to the Planning Board with additional information as requested, including the Long Form EAF.

The public hearing was left open.

CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING : SITE PLAN REVIEW : PINEBROOKE APARTMENTS : PINE TRAIL : KALEH

Mr. Kaleh and Mr. Keiffer, FRA Engineering, approached the Board with revised elevation drawings for the garages/carports. Chairman Heischman noted the new elevations were a substantial improvement. Ms. Taylor inquired as to the dimensions of the porches; Mr. Kaleh stated they would be 10'x10'.

Chairman Heischman presented a letter from the Village Conservation Board regarding the landscaping plans. The letter suggested that the street trees shown on the plans submitted be changed to white oak. Mr. Keiffer stated that the plant species would be changed to comply with the suggestions of the Conservation Board. Chairman Heischman inquired if the gazebo shown on the plans could be replaced with picnic tables. Mr. Kieffer stated that the issues of amenities could be addressed when the applicants returned for approval for Phase II.

Chairman Heischman invited Village Engineer Mike Schaffron to comment and discuss the project. An April 30, 2002 letter from Mr. Schaffron to Mr. Kieffer was reviewed. Mr. Schaffron stated that care should be taken at the construction entrance to avoid silt in Pine Trail during construction. Mr. Schaffron suggested coordination between the two Pine Trail projects in resolution of drainage issues. Mr. Keiffer stated that the storm sewer on Pine Trail would be able to handle the capacity of both projects, as the amount of total runoff would not be significant, and that revised calculations could be submitted for Mr. Schaffron's review. Mr. Schaffron inquired if the detention pond capacity would be greater due to utilization by the other projects. Mr. Keiffer replied that the pond could be enlarged to accommodate additional detention by the Conifer project if they wished to share the cost. Mr. Kieffer stated that this would enlarge the footprint of the pond. Mr. Schaffron stated that enlargement of the footprint of the pond would require additional review. Mr. Keiffer stated that while they welcomed cooperation in drainage issues with Conifer, the Pinebrooke project had been addressing drainage issues for months and would like to move forward rather than resubmit revised plans at this time. Mr. Keiffer stated that all drainage plans would be in compliance and approved by the Village Engineer.

Mr. Tobin inquired as to the status of the easement needed to proceed with the drainage plan across the airfield. Mr. Kieffer replied that the easement had not been finalized as yet due to investigation of concerns regarding the effect of bedrock in that area on the drainage plan. Mr. Keiffer stated that it was determined that bedrock would not interfere with the installation of the drainage line across the airfield. Mr. Keiffer stated that the easements were now in the process of finalization.

Chairman Heischman inquired as to the amount of disturbance. Mr. Keiffer stated that there would be a 20' construction zone, but that no significant amount of trees would be removed. Mr. Keiffer stated that the easement agreement provided for the developer to restore the disturbed area. Mr. Keiffer stated that the submission to Monroe County Water Department would eliminate the backflow prevention device but put the clubhouse/pool on 2" service. Mr. Keiffer stated that MCWA was ready to sign off on the plans.

Mr. Keiffer stated that the Monroe County DOT was in agreement with the traffic study, and that traffic counts would be done after Phase I to monitor turning lanes. Mr. Kieffer stated that they would be glad to do that as a condition of final approval. Mr. Schaffron stated that the concurrent development of the intersection with the Monroe Village Associates should be taken into account so that a mechanism would be in place to ensure that the final applicant/developer in the immediate affected area would not have to bear the entire burden of installing a traffic signal. Mr. Tobin stated that an Irrevocable Letter of Credit would need to be posted as a condition of final approval.

Contingencies for approval were next discussed. Mr. Tobin stated that the Environmental Assessment review had listed this project as an Unlisted Action. Mr. Tobin stated that as a DEIS had not been filed, the Board would need to determine if the criteria for approval of an Unlisted Action was met. Mr. Keiffer stated that environmental concerns had been formally addressed. Chairman Heischman inquired of Mr. Tobin what would be necessary for conditional approval in regards to the SEQR. Mr. Tobin stated that in view of the status of the project as an unlisted action, an approval should be contingent in environmental aspect upon the project being built in accordance with what had been approved. Mr. Tobin also stated that the approval should be subject to the developer contributing to the installation of a traffic signal. Mr. Tobin identified the issues that needed to be resolved as the drainage issue, the obtaining of easements by the developer and traffic issues. Mr. Keiffer stated that all issues could not be eliminated prior to approval, but would have to be in compliance with the Village Engineer. Mr. Keiffer stated that a return to the Planning Board would be necessary by the developers if there were significant changes to the site plan. Mr. Schaffron stated that it would take time for the Village to determine what direction to take. Mr. Kieffer stated that the criteria for final approval was Village-driven. Mr. Schaffron stated that while the two

projects in development on Pine Trail were independent of each other, any changes made to the detention pond due to collaboration between the developers would require a reevaluation of the drainage plans. Mr. Tobin stated that construction of the Pinebrook project could not begin until Mr. Schaffron had signed off on the plans. Mr. Tobin stated that this would require a conditional negative declaration on the SEQR.

Motion by Earll Fontaine, seconded by John Hoffman to declare a conditional Negative Declaration for the Pinebrook Apartment project on the State Environmental Quality Review.

Motion carried.

Motion by Betsy Taylor, seconded by Earll Fontaine to grant conditional site plan approval to Cornerbrook Development Inc. for the Pinebrook apartment project, pursuant to plans received with the following contingencies:

1. All plans will be subject to approval by the Village Engineer
2. Landscaping plans will reflect changes in street trees as per Village Conservation Board recommendations
3. All drainage issues will be resolved with the approval of the Village Engineer, Monroe County Water Authority, and the Department of Health
4. The applicants will post an Irrevocable Letter of Credit which will be used for the cost of a traffic signal
5. Applicants will obtain necessary easements to implement their drainage plan.

Motion carried.

DEIS REVIEW : PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT : WEST MAIN STREET: MONROE VILLAGE ASSOCIATES

Jerry Goldman, attorney for the applicants, reviewed the history of the project and DEIS submission procedure. Mr. Goldman stated that the applicant wished to solicit formal comments at tonight's meeting in order to get to a formal resolution point in the DEIS process.

Mr. Schaffron addressed the Board with comment regarding the project. He stated that the applicants needed to address the timeline for anticipated build up of the project. Mr. Schaffron also stated that a master plan would be needed to address proposed open space in the project. Mr. Smith stated that as the project progressed, the types of open space would be more defined. Chairman Hieschman agreed that open space designations needed clarification and should be included as part of the plan. A discussion of formal layouts as opposed to conceptual ensued.

A review of new road configurations followed. New plans showed three curb cuts: one in line with the Consler property, near St. Paul of the Cross cemetery; one opposite the Honeoye Falls Market Place, offset approximately 150'; and one opposite Pine Trail. Possible locations for temporary construction roads were briefly discussed. Mr. Goldman stated that the Monroe County DOT traffic analysis had been ok with the proposed configuration. Mr. Schaffron noted that the Traffic Impact Study needed to be completed and the noise issue addressed.

Mr. Goldman stated that regulations provided that the Village respond in writing as far as deficiencies in the DEIS. Mr. Tobin stated that for purpose of record, the April 30, 2002 letter from Mr. Schaffron served as a response to the applicants' initial submission. Mr. Tobin stated that Mr. Schaffron's letter would be modified and forwarded to the applicants. Mr. Tobin stated that there were still issues that needed to be addressed by the applicants; specifically, the level of service issue, and the effect of the development on the Historic district and the Village Business District.

OTHER BUSINESS

A special session meeting was scheduled for May 21, 2002 to review lighting issues.

ADJOURN

Motion by Earll Fontaine, seconded by Betsy Taylor, to adjourn the meeting at 11:00 p.m.
Motion carried, meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted

Sheila B. Coleman