

Final Minutes – Approved 10/2/17

Honeoye Falls Village Planning Board

Meeting Minutes for September 11, 2017

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mary Szlosek, Adam Keller, Brian Hoose, Ann Bailey, Denise Heischman

ALSO PRESENT: Michael Tobin (Village Attorney), Charlie Johnson (Building Inspector), Danny Bassett, Brian Anderson, Mary Louise Meisenzahl, Dan Holtje, Angeline Pike, Ryan Stoner, Pam Scully, Fran McGory, Eileen Scoville, Jake Harrington, Bob Bringley, David Jacobs

Chair Szlosek called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

A motion to approve the August 7, 2017 minutes as written was made by D. Heischman and seconded by A. Keller. A roll call vote was taken: Chair Szlosek-Aye, A. Bailey-Aye, B. Hoose-Aye, A. Keller-Aye, D. Heischman-Aye. Motion carried.

Site Plan Approval – 32 Norton Street – Norton Mills, LLC

Applicant, Ryan Stoner, came before the Board requesting site plan approval for a second floor expansion adding a third bedroom.

Chair Szlosek asked about lighting. R. Stoner said there would be no addition of external lighting. He added that the whole building will be re-sided.

D. Heischman mentioned that the building is Greek revival style and requested that the applicant look at any original detailing and molding width and do his best to keep the original or replicate wherever that detailing would have been.

Chair Szlosek clarified that there will be no new outdoor lighting, no change in gutters, and that the footprint is remaining the same.

There were no other comments from the Board.

Chair Szlosek opened the meeting for public comment. There were none.

A motion was made by B. Hoose and seconded by A. Bailey to approve the site plan as submitted with the understanding that the applicant will keep original detailing or replicate original detailing to the outside of the building. A roll call vote was taken: Chair Szlosek-Aye, A. Bailey-Aye, B. Hoose-Aye, A. Keller-Aye, D. Heischman-Aye. Motion carried.

The applicant signed the sign posting affidavit.

Continuation - Subdivision Approval – 2 Rittenhouse – Mary Louise Meisenzahl

Discussion was continued from the July 10 and August 7, 2017 Planning Board meetings as the Board was unable to make a decision because of information still needed. M. Meisenzahl submitted a letter and documentation prepared by D. Holtje to clarify the missing information from the original application.

Chair Szlosek mentioned one clarification where two sheds were added to the drawing. She questioned where they are in relation to the 60 foot setback.

C. Johnson answered that the southerly rear corner has a shed 10 feet from the corner, and he was not sure about the larger shed but stated that it only needs to be 3 feet from the property line.

M. Meisenzahl said there is a fence going around the sheds which are incorporated into the patio area.

Ann Bailey questioned if there is concern with drainage by adding another house to the neighborhood.

B. Anderson does not foresee any negative impact to the Village storm system by adding another house.

Chair Szlosek asked the Board for further comments. There were none.

Chair Szlosek opened the meeting for public comment.

Eileen Scoville of 35 Peer Street. She had concerns of whether the storm sewer discussed was the storm sewer she put in. She does not want to take on another property's water.

C. Johnson said the proposed lot pitches opposite of her swale and goes into the storm system at the street. All water has to be maintained on that property, and whoever builds could potentially do the same thing she did with managing water drainage. If a house were to be built on the lot, any storm water concerns could be better addressed at the time of site plan approval of that house.

Chair Szlosek read an email from a resident at 12 Rittenhouse Drive: "I am a resident of Rittenhouse Drive and I oppose the subdivision of the lot at #2. As you know, the lots on Rittenhouse Drive are unique and is one of the main reasons we purchased our home several years ago. Our lot sizes range from just under an acre to over an acre, and subdividing them would change the aesthetics of our neighborhood. The loss of green space will also disrupt the wild life that roam by the creek. Finally, the dividing of one lot could lead to the division of other lots on Rittenhouse, and I believe that would be a detriment to our neighborhood."

Chair Szlosek brought up the concern that D. Heischman mentioned at a previous meeting about the potential for flag lots. C. Johnson said that you would have to have enough street frontage in the parent lot. A minimum road frontage of 40 feet is required for a lot plus 12 feet to the existing building for a minimum side yard setback. Therefore, you would need 52 feet of land between the existing house and the property line since most houses on Rittenhouse have 100 or 150 feet of width. Having the house off center is the only way to conceive of creating a flag lot, but most placements of homes are centered on the lot, so the likelihood of flag lots is low.

Chair Szlosek reminded the Board that we had a similar letter of concern read at the last meeting. D. Heischman had concerns about setting a precedent for other subdivisions that would change the character of the village. We do have a range of lot sizes in the village.

Chair Szlosek closed the public portion of the meeting.

The Board went through Part 2 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form Impact Assessment and agreed as follows:

- 1 – “Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?” – All Board members answered, no or small impact
- 2 – “Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?” – B. Hoose, A. Keller answered, no or small impact. Chair Szlosek, A. Bailey, D. Heischman answered, moderate to large impact.
- 3 – “Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?” – B. Hoose, A. Keller answered, no or small impact. Chair Szlosek, A. Bailey, D. Heischman answered, moderate to large impact.
- 4 – “Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area?” – All Board members answered, no or small impact.
- 5 – “Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?” – All Board members answered, no or small impact.
- 6 – “Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?” – All Board members answered, no or small impact.
- 7 – “Will the proposed action impact existing public/private water supplies and/or public/private wastewater treatment utilities?” – All Board members answered, no or small impact.
- 8 – “Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?” – All Board members answered, no or small impact.
- 9 – “Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources?” – All Board members answered, no or small impact.
- 10 – “Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?” – All Board members answered, no or small impact.
- 11 – “Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?” – All Board members answered, no or small impact.

The Board went through Part 3 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form Impact Assessment to give an explanation for any answers from Part 2 that were answered with moderate to large impact.

2 – “Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?” – The Board members who answered moderate to large impact explained that: The intensity is changed from the original intent of the planned community (with each residential lot being approximately 1 acre in size) for a total of 14 houses in this development, and it does not allow for maintaining the same level of intensity throughout the neighborhood (it does not encourage the level of intensity).

3 – “Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?” – The Board members who answered moderate to large impact explained that: The character of the neighborhood is being changed to the detriment of the original intended character which has been maintained since it was built. The lot that is proposed to be divided is the same size as the other lots. Documents from

neighbors oppose this change in size of lots on Rittenhouse Drive. The original development as it is currently today, 7 lots (.9 acres each) on the north side of Rittenhouse Drive are all open. Subdividing one will change this character feature of the neighborhood. It will impact the open green space and the privacy that is in existence for all residents.

The SEQR form was signed by Chair Szlosek determining that based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, the proposed action may result in one or more potentially large or significant adverse impacts, and an environmental impact statement is required.

A motion was made by B. Hoose and seconded by A. Bailey to declare the Honeoye Falls Planning Board as lead agency. Chair Szlosek-Aye, A. Keller-Aye, A. Bailey-Aye, B. Hoose-Aye, Denise Heischman-Aye. Motion carried.

A motion was made by A. Bailey and seconded by D. Heischman to declare that the project will result in one or more potentially large or significant adverse impacts on the environment, and therefore, an environmental impact statement will need to be prepared. Chair Szlosek-Aye, A. Keller-Nay, A. Bailey-Aye, B. Hoose-Nay, Denise Heischman-Aye. Motion carried.

M. Meisenzahl has already prepared her portion of the long form and presented it to the Board for their review to take action. The Board will review and discuss this at the October 2, 2017 meeting.

The applicant is not required to post a sign for the upcoming meeting as the public hearing is now closed.

Concept Discussion – 100 Lot Subdivision – Wolfberger Park

The Board had a concept discussion on the potential for a 100 lot subdivision.

A motion was made by B. Hoose and seconded by A. Keller to adjourn the meeting at 9:42 p.m. A roll call vote was taken: Chair Szlosek-Aye, A. Bailey-Aye, B. Hoose-Aye, A. Keller-Aye, D. Heischman-Aye. Motion carried.

**Respectfully submitted,
Patty Pragle
Planning Board Clerk**