

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Joe Cooley; Denise Heischman; Betsy Taylor; Judy Tobin

**ALSO PRESENT:** Charlie Johnson; Danny Bassette; Ed Walsh; Tom Fromberger; Michael Guyon; Judy Lewis; Victoria Lewis Bush; Scott Hemenway; Craig Moffitt; Laurie Gunther; Glenda Reilly; Jennifer Reilly; Denise Dickinson; Eileen Weigert; Tom Weigert; Roy McMahon; Ryan Stoner; Ian McNabb; Rick West; Dan Altamura; Gary Garofalo

Chairman Cooley opened the public hearing at 7:31 PM.

**SITE PLAN APPROVAL: 166 W. MAIN ST.**

Rick West (Honeoye Falls Plaza) and Dan Altamura (architect) explained that they had applied to the July 27, 2009 meeting of the Zoning Board for a side setback variance. The ZBA had tabled the decision and asked Mr. West if he could either make the drive one way traffic only or change the western addition to 20' instead of 25'. Mr. West chose the latter option and the plans are now for a 37' x 44' addition in the rear of the plaza and a 20' x 60' addition on the western end of the plaza. This will leave a 24' driveway and 4' of grass area.

Judy Tobin asked if there are extra parking spaces. Mr. Altamura said there are extra spaces. Eighteen spaces are required and they have twenty-four. Ms. Tobin explained that she is concerned about safety if there is a fire and asked if it would be possible to remove 2-3 of the angled parking spaces on the western side and mark the lane as a fire lane. Mr. Altamura said they will do that.

Denise Heischman asked if the parking spaces on the west side and the spaces at the rear of the building were mostly employee parking. Mr. West said they were used almost exclusively by employees.

Chair Cooley asked how they were going to designate the rear parking spaces since they can't stripe on gravel. Mr. Altamura said they had no plans to stripe them. This raised the questions as to whether parking spaces need to be striped. The Board reached the conclusion that there doesn't appear to be a legal requirement for striping and therefore these spaces do not need to be striped as long as Honeoye Falls Plaza can demonstrate that the site can accommodate the required number of parking spaces.

The concrete barrier will be removed. The light pole will be relocated.

Ms. Heschman inquired about lighting. Mr. Altamura said they will replicate the current lighting. They will also put lights above the exits in the rear. These will be wallpacks that shine down.

Ms. Tobin suggested that Mr. West might want to put some kind of barrier between Honeoye Falls Plaza and Star Headlights to stop trespassing. She stressed that this was just a suggestion and not a requirement.

Chair Cooley opened the public hearing at 7:42. There were no comments/questions so the public hearing was closed.

Chair Cooley said he sees no problem with the rear spaces being un-striped since it is only employee parking and it is not densely occupied. Betsy Taylor and Judy Tobin agreed. Denise Heischman commented that Mr. West might want to put up a "No Parking Beyond This Point" sign to keep people from pulling forward and thereby potentially interfering with emergency access.

Motion by Betsy Taylor, seconded by Denise Heischman that the site plan be approved contingent on removing 3 of the angled parking spaces on the west, removing the concrete planter and putting lights above the exits and working with Charlie Johnson on parking restrictions.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

1. J. Cooley – Aye
2. D. Heischman – Aye
3. B. Taylor - Aye
4. J. Tobin – Aye

**ALL IN FAVOR**

**MOTION CARRIED – SITE PLAN APPROVAL GRANTED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. Removal of three of the angled parking spaces on the west
2. Remove concrete planter
3. Install lights above the rear exits
4. Work with Charlie Johnson on parking restrictions

The Board completed the SEQR for 166 N. Main St. Motion by Denise Heischman, seconded by Judy Tobin to approve the SEQR Negative Declaration on 166 N. Main St.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

1. J. Cooley – Aye
2. D. Heischman – Aye
3. B. Taylor - Aye
4. J. Tobin – Aye

**ALL IN FAVOR, NEGATIVE DECLARATION GRANTED**



**SITE PLAN APPROVAL: 34 NORTON ST.**

Ryan Stoner (Mathstone) and Gary Garofalo (Avery Engineering) presented plans for the addition of a two story, four unit apartment building to an existing site at 34 Norton St. This was formerly National Fuel. There is a gravel parking lot in back and an asphalt parking lot on the side. There are two driveway entrances. They plan to maintain both driveways and use one for the apartment building and the other (along with the asphalt parking lot) for the retail space. The building is currently vacant. Ryan Stoner said he is not sure if it will be retail or office/business use.

Mr. Garofalo said they will remove some of the gravel area and plant grass, thereby reducing the imperviousness of the site and cutting down the run-off from the site. Mr. Stoner said a little more than half the gravel area will be removed and replaced with grass.

Denise Heischman asked if it was possible to reduce any of the parking spaces. Mr. Stoner said there are only twelve parking spaces. They will probably fill half of them with employees. It is likely that the apartment residents will have guests that need to park so he wouldn't feel comfortable cutting the number of spaces down much more than what it is. Mr. Garofalo pointed out that the code (based on size of building) ... "requires 9 spaces so there aren't very many extra anyway."

Ms. Heischman asked if they were compliant on lot coverage for impervious surface. Mr. Garofalo said the requirement is for 25% green space. They currently have 28.9% and they will be increasing that by removing the gravel space around the building.

Judy Tobin stated that the code requires the parking to go behind the building. Mr. Altamura said he thought that since it was an existing parking lot, they could leave it as is. Ms. Tobin said that the parking must go in the rear on any new construction unless they get a variance. Mr. Stoner said that, in this case, putting the parking in the rear would actually make the site less visibly appealing and he will go to the ZBA to request a variance.

Denise Heischman asked about curb cuts. Ryan Stoner said there have always been two curb cuts and that will remain. However, they reduced the curb cut when they built 25 Norton St. and they have put in a speed bump so Mr. Stoner feels they have already done quite a bit to reduce the amount of traffic on Norton St.

Ms. Heischman asked if any of the existing street trees will be lost. Mr. Stoner said they will keep the two existing trees. Betsy Taylor asked if there are existing power poles on the street. Mr. Stoner said there are two poles so they can only plant small street trees.

Ms. Heischman asked if the site meets the side setback requirements. The required side setback is 12' and the current plans meet that requirement. However, there is a problem with the rear setback. Mr. Garofalo said he thought there was no requirement for a rear setback in the TV District. Judy Tobin explained that the table posted on the Village website was incorrect. Ms. Tobin further explained that in a mixed used district like TV, the non-residential requirements apply and therefore a 20' rear setback is needed.

Charlie Johnson raised the issue of the postal address for the residential building. The code states that the address must be visible from the street, the letters/numbers must be a minimum of 4" high and contrasting with the surrounding background. This building is very far back and therefore could cause a problem in an emergency situation since the fire department, ambulance, etc. might not be able to locate it since it is not visible from the street. He asked Mr. Stoner if he had had any further thoughts on how to make the number more visible from the road. Mr. Stoner said he is open to suggestions. Mr. Johnson said one idea would be to have a 4x4 post at the driveway saying, for example, "Apartments A-E in rear". Another suggestion is putting a bigger number on the building. Mr. Stoner said he will put some sort of address board at the street.

The subject of drainage was raised in. Mr. Garofalo said that virtually all their drainage heads to the south and will empty into the pond water for the Norton Mills subdivision. Judy Tobin said storm water must be managed on your own property. Charlie Johnson concurred and explained that NYS requires storm water to be managed on site. If the storm water is going to be conveyed off-site to a pre-existing pond, then they will need an easement. Mr. Garofalo said they are managing it on site by reducing the amount of impervious surface and decreasing the amount of discharge from the site. Mr. Stoner said they can easily put an easement going out, if required.

Judy Tobin asked for verification from Mr. Stoner that the revised plans will show all adjacent buildings within 300 feet.

Betsy Taylor asked if these units will have access to the trail being built as part of Norton Mills. Mr. Stoner said they will have access.

Chair Cooley opened the public hearing at 8:25. There were no comments/questions so the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Stoner must submit revised plans and get a variance from the Zoning Board before the Board can act on his application.



**SUBDIVISION APPROVAL: 15 NORTON ST, 25 NORTON ST and LEHIGH ST. (tax no. 228-42-1-3)**

Mathstone Corp. would like to re-subdivide the three lots at the corner of Lehigh St. and Norton St in order to obtain better proportions. The first lot currently has one residential home. The second lot currently has two buildings and is mixed residential and commercial. The third lot consists of old town barns. They are requesting demolition of the barns.

As part of the re-subdivision, the first lot would be reduced to approximately 16,800 sf., and the second lot would be increased to approximately .5 acre and the third lot would be about .6 acre. One lot (15 Norton St.) will remain 100% residential. The other two lots will have three buildings each and will be a mixture of commercial and residential.

The remainder of the discussion is based mainly on the two mixed usage lots.

Denise Heischman asked Mr. Stoner if he had been to the ZBA for approval for the commercial aspect. Mr. Garofalo said they had been to the ZBA and received an area variance to have a commercial/residential mix of 6%/94% on the northern lot and 30%/70% on the other lot. Mr. Stoner added that they had discussed with the ZBA designing the space in such a way as to be able to convert some of the residential space back to commercial, if Mr. Stoner felt the market conditions warranted it.

Ms. Heischman said she had some concerns about the density issue. The combination of the two lots is a little over an acre and the TV zone requires 25% open space for all lots over an acre. Without the open space consideration Mr. Stoner is actually building what seems more like RA which is just high density apartments instead of the TV district. Mr. Stoner said it can't be looked at as a whole unit since it is actually more than one unit. They have already had comments back from the village engineer and Monroe County water saying that they can't combine they can't sewer laterals, they can't cross property lines and they can't use a common a water line. If it is one unit then all the engineering requirements for a single unit should apply and it doesn't. Monroe County water is also treating it as two units.

Ms. Heischman said they (the Planning Board) are looking at this as a subdivision and therefore it makes sense to treat the two lots as one unit for Planning Board purposes. Mr. Garofalo said it is a re-subdivision. It is currently three lots and will remain as three lots. They are just asking to move the boundaries of the lots to make them better balanced. Each lot on its own is less than one acre and therefore the open space requirement doesn't apply.

Judy Tobin read from the code (§ 190-45.B) which states: "...any development or subdivision of land containing one acre or more shall provide for open space. In the event that a parcel of land to be subdivided or developed is less than one acre, the Planning Board may vary the dimensional and open space requirements of this section..."

Chair Cooley asked how far short they are of 25% open space. Charlie Johnson said that the first lot is 43% green space and lot two is 32% green space. However, green space is not necessarily the same as open space. The definition for green space doesn't talk about designation for public use. The code (§ 190-45.C) states that open space "...shall include an area that is intended to provide light and air, and is designated for either environmental, scenic, or recreational purposes." Chair Cooley said that in this case the open space is the green space. Mr. Garofalo asked if the open space has to be one contiguous area. Ms. Heischman said it doesn't need to be one contiguous space but it generally does not consist of lawns but could be space set aside for common use by the residents.

Mr. Stoner reiterated that he still doesn't agree that it should be considered as one parcel. It is currently three parcels and will remain as three parcels. They are not creating a new parcel, they are simply moving the property lines to re-define the existing parcels. He could have come in with separate applications for each lot but felt it was more expedient to get it all done at once.

Ms. Heischman pointed out that the Norton Mills subdivision were all separate lots but the space was treated as one unit. Mr. Stoner pointed out that Norton Mills was one parcel being divided into lots. The difference is that this is already three lots and will remain as three lots. Judy Tobin said she agrees with Mr. Stoner that it has to be treated as separate lots as opposed to one unit.

Ms. Heischman commented that another density issue is that the plans show the area to be mostly buildings and parking lots and not much else. There are going to be three, four family buildings on the lot which will increase the parking requirement. Ms. Heischman asked if they all have to be four-family buildings. Mr. Garofalo said the intent was to replace what is currently there so as to maintain the streetscape. If they reduce the buildings substantially, then they will lose the feel of what there is now which is a couple of big barns.

Betsy Taylor commented that the area is starting to feel like an office park with a lot of pavement and a lot of parking. It doesn't have the feel of what one would expect in the TV district. Mr. Stoner said that it he understands that it might look a bit like an office park on paper, but it won't feel like an office park after he builds it. Right now they are just looking at plans with a bunch of square boxes. Once the buildings are up with landscaping and facades, it will have a much friendlier feel.

There was some discussion about screening between this property and the existing houses on Monroe St. Mr. Stoner said there is a hedgerow there already and they were thinking about spruce trees so there would be winter screening. Mr. Stoner also pointed out that the structures that border his property are barns and a church so privacy should not be much of an issue. Betsy Taylor remarked that rows of blue spruce would look out of character behind Victorian homes and she thinks fences would be more appropriate.

Ms. Heischman said there is a problem with the width of the frontage of the lot. They only have 80' and they should have 100' on any lot that has a four-family unit. Mr. Garofalo said they could slide the property line over a bit to get the 100' width if necessary. He added that, based on his interpretation, there is some confusion in the code as to whether the 100' front width applies. The code (§ 190-39.1.B) states that if it is a mixed use lot (which this lot is), then it is governed by the non-residential requirement which says there is no minimum front width requirement.

There was more discussion as to whether this should be treated as two separate lots. It was agreed that it should be treated as separate lots and Mr. Ryan will have to file separate subdivision maps with Monroe County. Since it has been agreed that it is separate lots, the 25% open space is not an issue.

Chair Cooley opened the public hearing at 9:13. There were no comments/questions so the public hearing was closed.

Motion by Judy Tobin, seconded by Denise Heischman to approve subdivision of these parcels contingent on submission of separate subdivision maps that replicate the details on the current map.

#### ROLL CALL VOTE

1. J. Cooley – Aye
2. D. Heischman – Aye
3. B. Taylor - Aye
4. J. Tobin – Aye

#### **MOTION CARRIED – SUBDIVISION APPROVAL**

Motion by Judy Tobin, seconded by Betsy Taylor to approve the SEQR Negative Declaration.

#### ROLL CALL VOTE

1. J. Cooley – Aye
2. D. Heischman – Aye
3. B. Taylor - Aye
4. J. Tobin – Aye

### **ALL IN FAVOR, NEGATIVE DECLARATION GRANTED**

Chair Cooley told Mr. Stoner and Mr. Garofalo that they now had to apply to the Zoning Board for an area variance to have parking on the side instead of in the rear.

Mr. Garafalo asked for clarification on the frontage requirement. The Board agreed that, since the building is mixed use, they are governed by the non-residential requirements and therefore there is no minimum for the front width.

Judy Tobin said they will also need a variance for the rear setback being less than the 20' minimum. Mr. Stoner and Mr. Garofalo pointed out that they relied on the information in the on-line of requirements which said there is no minimum for the rear setback. The Board apologized to Mr. Stoner for the discrepancy and explained that the on-line table was incorrect. The minimum rear setback is requirement 20'.

Mr. Garofalo asked if the Board could make a determination on the demolition of the barns. The Board agreed that the demolition should be acted on at the same time as the site plan. They can't make any determination until Mr. Stoner gets his variances and submits completed site plans.



### **SKETCH PLAN DISCUSSION: 22 N. MAIN ST.**

Scot Hemenway (architect – HBT Architects) presented sketch plans for the new library to be built at 22 N. Main St. The new library will incorporate the existing library, which is approximately 4000 sf. and a new building which will be approximately 8000 sf. Access to the library will be from N. Main St. The current exit driveway on Monroe St. will be for pedestrian traffic only and the current entrance driveway will be for service traffic only.

Tom Fromberger (MRB Group) described the overall layout of the new site. The site currently exists of three parcels. The first parcel is the current library, zoned R1. The second lot is in the back and is approximately one acre and is zoned R1. The third lot is where the existing red barn is and is approximately .4 acres, zoned VB. The combined total is about 2 acres.

Access to the parking lot will be from N. Main St. There will be a book drop-off in the front of the library. There will be no vehicular entry to the new library from Monroe St. The current exit drive on Monroe St. will be pedestrianized and the current entry drive will be used for occasional deliveries from Monroe County. The delivery schedule is generally 8-12 Mon-Tue or Thu-Fri, depending on the rotation.

Judy Tobin asked if the delivery trucks will be backing out of the driveway. Mr. Fromberger said they would have to either back out or back in since there is no room to turn around once in the drive.

The current library has a dumpster on site but this will not be the case with the new library. They will use totes which will be rolled out to the curb on Monroe St. so there will be no dumpster pickup or delivery via that drive.

They are planning 43 parking spaces in the back of the new building. The requirement is between 35-52 spaces are required, depending on how you calculate it, 43 is approximately the middle ground of the

range. Chair Cooley asked for clarification on this. Mr. Fromberger explained that the code requires either one parking space for every three seats or one parking space per 40 sf. of seating area.

They will evaluate the utilities in the current library to see what can be served from those. The barn is currently served off of N. Main St. There is an existing 28' wide easement that runs to N. Main St. They are looking at various options for storm water management. A lot of the current site is pervious and they hope to compensate for those areas.

Lighting will be dark sky compliant. There will be lights along the entry area and lights in the back for security. They are still working on the landscaping. There will be a reading garden in the front and terraces along the side.

Scott Hemenway showed the renderings for the new building. There will be a two story, open area adult reading room in the front which will be timber framed and stone clad. Behind this there will be a white clapboard building which will be the main entrance to the library. This will have a covered entrance.

Denise Heischman said she felt the style of the covered entrance was a bit incongruous with the rest of the building. Mr. Hemenway said they were looking for something that would be inviting and draw people visually so they could easily find the entrance. Ms. Heischman said she didn't think the form of it looked right on the white clapboard building. Mr. Hemenway said that that part of the plan is enough in its infancy that they could conceivably change it a bit. Ms. Heischman said she thinks a covered porch idea is a great idea.

Betsy Taylor raised the issue of overhangs. She stated that she felt it looked wrong without overhangs. Mr. Fromberger said that if you look around the Village, you will find a mixture. Although most buildings have overhangs, some don't. Generally speaking, the stone buildings don't have overhangs and clapboard buildings do and that is why they put a bit of an overhang on the clapboard building but none on the stone-clad building.

Chair Cooley stated that he liked the forms and thinks they are appropriate for the Village. He commented that there is often a tendency to go over the top when historic architecture is mimicked but the library design managed to avoid this.

Charlie Johnson said the Conservation Board would like to see the extent of the woodland EPOD on any future drawings. They would also like to see planting and landscape plans that show tree plantings that would screen parking from the neighboring properties, site drainage design and any signage that will indicate bicycle and pedestrian access from Monroe St.

The Honeoye Falls Fire Department need more information on driveway widths before they can comment on emergency access for their vehicles.

Some concern was raised by the board as to the drive used for deliveries. Laurie Gunther (librarian) said they current get one delivery from Monroe County per day. The deliveries will be Mon-Fri, sometime between 8:00-noon. A delivery takes about 10 minutes. Denise Heischman asked if the book deliveries could happen from the N. Main St. entrance instead of the Monroe St drive. Mr. Fromberger explained that the reason they will have the deliveries from Monroe St. is that the circulation desk is right there and that is where the staff work area is so it wouldn't make sense to bring the books in from the Main St. entrance.

Chair Cooley opened the public hearing at 9:50.

Danny Bassette suggested that the book delivery truck comes in from Main St. and then exit via the Monroe St. drive. This would mean that the books were dropped off at the main entrance instead of

behind the circulation desk. Laurie Gunther said another consideration in deciding that the book deliveries should be made via a separate entrance is the number of children that come to the library. They felt it was safer not to have large trucks near where the children are.

Betsy Taylor said that she was concerned about trucks backing out onto Monroe St. Laurie Gunther said they can tell the delivery trucks that they have to back in and drive out, thereby eliminating the concern of trucks backing onto Monroe St.

There were no further comments so the public hearing was closed at 9:53.



### **SKETCH PLAN DISCUSSION: PROPERTY ADJACENT TO 563 QUAKER MEETING HOUSE RD.**

Judy Tobin recused herself because Mr. Zagar is a client of the law office.

Scott Dehollander (engineer) presented plans on behalf of Mo Zagar to build a single family residence. Total site is approximately 2 acres which was formerly in the Town of Mendon but has now been annexed to the Village and zoned R1. The parcel is about 700' deep with a frontage of about 145'. It is currently overgrown and Mr. Zagar wants to develop the front area of the lot in order to build the single family residence. They propose to connect to the existing municipal water and the available sanitary sewer service.

The trickiest aspect in designing the site is drainage. Currently there is a drainage swale mid-site and water from the middle school, which is to the south of this parcel, crosses this parcel and drains to the north. That creates an extensive low area that is inundated with water. They propose to stay out of that area. Their site is located upland and away from that area.

There is also an existing water issue in the northwest corner adjacent to Quaker Meetinghouse Rd. This area doesn't have an outlet for the road drainage. Due to some depressions in the existing grading, it holds water and there are quite a few cattails that are growing there. This area is not a protected wetland so their solution is to make grading modifications to eliminate this wet area in such a way that the pond that is there now is redirected towards the rear of the parcel where it will be connected to the existing drainage ditch.

Denise Heischman asked if the driveway was going to be paved or gravel. Mr. Zagar said it will be paved.

Charlie Johnson said his understanding is that the water that comes from the middle school drains across this site and ends up onto the back side of Olde Falls Village. During the spring when the snow melt increases the flow and the catch basins are overly full and the yards start to flood. There have been accounts of boats floating and flooding basements.

Mr. Dehollander said that the footprint of their site is about 8' high than Olde Falls Village so they will not suffer the same flooding fate that others have. They also recognize that there is a drainage problem in the area. They aren't saying they can fix the problem but they are determined not to contribute to it or make it any worse than it already is.

Charlie Johnson said that since this site sort of hosts this drainage condition, any development on this site can't have any flow going off-site. All driveway water, roof water, etc. must be contained on site and it can't add to the already existing problem. Mr. Johnson further stated that Mike Shaffron commented that because of the unique nature of this site, storm water will be a critical issue.

Betsy Taylor asked what the plans were for the front of the property. Mr. Zagar said it would be all lawn. Ms. Taylor said that will probably increase water so swales will be important. Mr. Johnson inquired as to how far back the site is from the road. Mr. Dehollander said 200'.

Mr. Dehollander said they haven't yet finalized their plans for dealing with the storm water but one thing they were looking at was a modification to the outlet of the drainage ditch to create a slight weir which would eventually help the situation downstream from them at Olde Falls Village. This boils down to basically putting an outlet control structure in the stream. Ms. Heishman asked what about an actual retention pond to hold the water. Mr. Dehollander said they are not talking about a lot of water since it is only one, single family home and they think this weir will be sufficient to not only deal with the water from this home but also might have a regional benefit in decreasing the water. They haven't finished the calculations but he believes this might be more beneficial to the region than a retention pond which would only hold the water from this one residence.

Chair Cooley inquired as to whether the drainage ditch is solely a result from drainage from the middle school or is it a natural ditch. Mr. Johnson said there is a natural water flow. The inlet in Olde Falls Village was part of the original design of that site. There was supposed to be a head wall that never got built.

Charlie Johnson received an emailed letter from the owners of Olde Falls Village, commenting on their concerns about this development (see attached).

Denise Heischman asked if it would be possible to move the house closer to the road which would allow for a shorter driveway and therefore less drainage.

Tom and Eileen Weigert (565 Quaker Meeting House Rd) said drainage is a very big problem and they don't think the existing pond can handle any more water. Their side lawn is always saturated. They have just spent thousands of dollars have things put in to deal with their drainage problem so they are very concerned about this new development adding to the issue.

Chair Cooley asked if Mr. Dehollander has computed the amount of drainage volume will be from that site. Mr. Dehollander said this site is type 'C' soil which is pretty much non-infiltrating, problematic soil. Although they haven't calculated the current drainage, a single family lot in a 'C' soil area typically has less impact on the area drainage than a site with 'A' or 'B' soil. Therefore they expect minimal drainage peaks which will be easily dealt with on their site. However, this might not change the existing condition on other sites.

Ed Walsh (567 Quaker Meeting House Rd.) asked if Mr. Zagar planned on having a basement. Mr. Dehollander said there is a plan for a basement and one of the reasons the location on this site was chosen was to enable a walk-out basement.

Betsy Taylor asked if there were existing trees. Eileen Weigert commented that there were quite a few very large trees on the lot and she was wondering how much of it Mr. Zagar was planning on clearing. Mr. Dehollander said the plan was to clear right up to the property line but this could change as they look into it further.

Denise Heischman asked if this property was in any kind of EPOD. Charlie Johnson explained that the property has just been added to the Village and therefore has not been evaluated for EPODS. Ms. Heischman suggested that they make some sort of water garden with plants that will help with drainage. Mr. Dehollander said he felt this was a good idea and they will look into it.

Ed Walsh (Chair, Town of Mendon Planning Board) said this application had come before them in the past when the parcel was part of the Town of Mendon. Their thought was that they couldn't approve any plan that would increase the amount of water flowing to Olde Falls Village. If possible, pressure should be put on the middle school to fix the problem they created by not dealing properly with the drainage issue

when the middle school was built. The school put in a large amount of non-permeable surface and didn't put in an adequate retention pond to protect surrounding properties.



**APPROVE MINUTES – JUNE 1, 2009**

Approval of minutes tabled until the next meeting since only two of the three members who attended the June meeting were present.

**APPROVE MINUTES – JULY 6, 2009**

Approval of minutes tabled until the next meeting since only two of the three members who attended the July meeting were present.



Motion by Judy Tobin, seconded by Joe Cooley to adjourn the meeting at 10:31 PM.

**ALL IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED**

*Respectfully submitted,  
Judi Barrett, Planning Board Clerk*

**From:** Vinod K. Luthra [mailto:[vk1@barringtonresidential.com](mailto:vk1@barringtonresidential.com)]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 03, 2009 5:54 PM  
**To:** [charlievhf@frontiernet.net](mailto:charlievhf@frontiernet.net)  
**Cc:** 'Vinod K. Luthra'; 'Amit J. Luthra'; 'Sangeeta Arora'  
**Subject:** 245 East Street - Olde Falls Village

August 3, 2009

To: Planning Board of the Village of Honeoye Falls

We are the owner of Olde Falls Village located at 245 East Street in Honeoye Falls. We are deeply concerned about additional water runoff potentially caused by the new planned construction of a single family dwelling on Quaker Meeting House Road. We are requesting the catchment area be well designed to adequately protect our property incase of extreme rainfall. We currently do have a water drainage issue on our property due to the clay nature of the soil. We feel that an improperly designed water management system will exacerbate the serious issue that exists today.

Regards,

Vinod Luthra

---

Vinod K. Luthra  
Indus Honoeye Falls Associates LLC  
585.739.6137 p  
585.672.1050 f  
[vk1@barringtonresidential.com](mailto:vk1@barringtonresidential.com)  
[www.barringtonresidential.com](http://www.barringtonresidential.com)