

**Minutes of the Town of Perinton
Planning Board Meeting of April 2, 2014**

Planning Board Members Present

Mark Anderson, Chairman
T.C. Lewis
James P. Brasley
Kenneth O'Brien
Norm Gardner
Sandra Neu

Absent

Craig Antonelli

Conservation Board Members Present

Robert Salmon
Andrew Rodman

Town Officials Present

Robert Place, Town Attorney
Thomas Beck, Commissioner, DPW
Robert Kozarits, Town Engineer
Michael Doser, Director Code Enforcement & Development (CED)
Lori Stid, Planning Board Clerk

Mr. Anderson called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm, introduced the Board and staff present, and explained the procedures.

Pended Application(s):

Creekstone Development (Pride Mark Homes, Inc.) Costich Engineering, as agent for PM Development of Rochester, LP, owner of property located at NYS Route 31 & Mason Road (tax id# 180.08-1-3.111), requesting preliminary and final subdivision approval for a two lot subdivision and preliminary and final site plan approval for a Planned Development District to develop a 39.9 acre parcel at the northeast corner of the intersections of Pittsford-Palmyra Road and Mason Road for a 160 unit residential development consisting of single family detached single story homes for rent, single story townhomes for rent, three apartment buildings with one and two bedroom units for rent, four Green House style assisted living homes, open space park amenity, two garage buildings for resident storage, a storage/maintenance garage for property management, and a community center, pool, cabana building and leasing office.

Presenter: Jim Barbato, Jr.

Zoned: Currently zoned Residential B; pending rezoning to PDD

Mr. Anderson states that the Town Board granted a Negative Declaration of SEQR on 3/26/14.

Jim Barbato Jr. presented the plans to the Board as per letter of intent from Costich Engineering as shown below.



**COSTICH
ENGINEERING, P.C.**

March 07, 2014

Mr. Robert J. Kozarits, P.E.
Town Engineer
Town of Perinton, DPW
100 Cobb's Lane
Fairport, NY 14450

Re: Creekstone Development
Engineering Comments Response Letter



Dear Rob:

On behalf of our client, Jim Barbado, Pride Mark Homes, Inc., we are submitting revised construction documents for the above referenced project. The plans have been revised to address the February 14, 2014 Department of Public Works, Code Enforcement Department comment letter.

The following responses are offered to address your comment letter:

DPW Comments

General

1. We acknowledge a subdivision map will need to be filed in the Monroe County Clerk's Office prior to obtaining Town signatures on the site plans.
2. The sidewalks along Mason Road have been revised based on a meeting with DPW staff and reflect the alignment agreed upon with DPW staff.
3. We acknowledge that a letter of credit estimate for all site work will need to be prepared and the amount agreed upon with the DPW prior to obtaining Town signatures on the site plans.
4. We acknowledge that a preconstruction meeting will be required prior to commencing any work. A note to this affect has been added to the Mass Earthwork and Erosion Control plan, sheet CA100.
5. The notes that appear on the Mass Earthwork and Erosion Control Plan have been revised to provide additional clarification and direction for the scope of work and phasing of earthwork operations. Additional notes have been added to the Utility plan sheet and Provide plan for potential well pointing of utility installations.
6. The notes on the Mass Earthwork and Erosion Control Plan have been revised to provide a note indicating the existing tank/culvert is to remain in place during mass earthwork operations and to outline reinforcement measures.
7. A typical roadway section has been added for the private drives and appears on detail sheet CA500. The Roadways have been labeled as "Private Drives" on the Site and Pavement Marking Plan (Sheet CA110) and on the detail.
8. A note has been added to the Mass Earthwork and Erosion Control plan (Sheet CA100) indicating that the property lines shall be surveyed and staked where the grading limits abut the residential properties on the north and east side of the project.
9. We acknowledge that the applicant shall install property monuments on all property corners. Property monuments have been added to the Site & Pavement Marking plan (sheet CA110) and will also appear on the Subdivision Map.

10. Additional profiles for sanitary and storm sewer reaches have been prepared. An additional sheet has been added to the plan set (Sheet CA310). A portion of sanitary and storm sewers along Creekview Drive have been revised to eliminate a crossing conflict between the sanitary and storm sewers. The sanitary and storm sewer alignments have switched locations and the discharge point to SWMF 1A has been revised.
11. The sanitary manhole detail has been revised to provide 6-inches of concrete between the invert of the pipe and the bottom of the manhole.
12. A note has been added to the Utility plan (sheet CA120) indicating that the connection to the existing sanitary manholes are to be made utilizing a Kor-N-Seal boot and that a onsite meeting with DPW staff is required before performing this work.
13. Anti-seep collars have been added to the sanitary sewer alignments at 250-foot spacing. A detail for the anti-seep collar has been added to the construction details for the project (CA500).
14. A compaction schedule has been added to the roadway and sewer profile sheets (CA300, CA310).
15. The easement over storm structures DD4.1 to DD4.2 and DD6.0 to DD7.0 has been eliminated.
16. An easement over the sanitary sewer serving buildings 1-4 and 5-12, and between SA1.0 and SA0.0 have been added to the utility plan (sheet CA120).
17. Clean-outs have been added to the sanitary laterals on the Utility plan (sheet CA120) at a maximum spacing of 90-feet between clean-outs.
18. The sanitary sewer system has been revised to reflect a 0.3-foot drop occurring within manholes with a 90 degree bend. The revision appears on the Utility plan (sheet CA120) and Profiles (CA300, CA310).
19. The annotation for the end section for the 15-inch outfall pipe for structure DO-1A has been revised to reflect that it is a 15-inch end section.

Grading/Erosion Control

20. A detail for the Dewatering Fingers has been added to the construction details (CA520). Silt fencing and straw bales have been added to the perimeter of the siltation basins (CA100).
21. The silt fence detail has been revised to reflect the detail which includes woven wire fabric support (CA520).
22. A compaction schedule has been added to the Road Profiles (sheet CA500).
23. The proposed construction entrances have been revised to be 100-feet long (sheet CA100).
24. Storm structure DC2.0 on the profile sheet, (CA300).
25. The detail for the Board-On-Board Fence has been revised to correspond with the plan annotation for a 6-foot high fence (LA110).

Miscellaneous Details

26. The detail for the culvert on sheet CA520 has been revised to call-out the structure to be a precast concrete structure. A waterproof membrane has been added to the top of the culvert where the roadway section goes over the culvert. The intent is to pour the footer in place, so a 6-inch leveling pad is currently not being depicted. The graphical representation of the wing wall configuration has been revised to depict the wing wall aligning with the wall of the culvert.

SWPPP Comments

27. The run-off depth value "P" has been revised in the water quality volumes to 1.00 rather than 0.85, to reflect the value utilized in accordance with the Irondequoit Creek Watershed Collaborative.
28. Water quality volume calculations have been revised to reflect the current design.
29. Discrepancies between the SWPPP and plans for Pond 1A have been revised.
30. Discrepancies between the SWPPP and plans for Pond 1B have been revised.
31. Discrepancies between the SWPPP and plans for Pond 2 have been revised.

CED Comments

1. The plans have been revised to provide twenty-five (25) additional guest parking spaces at the Townhouse and Single-Family parking areas. The parking data (sheet CA110) has been updated to reflect the additional parking spaces provided and to reflect that the Townhouses and Single family units are capable of providing four (4) spaces at each unit (two-car garage and two in the driveway). The overall parking counts have been revised.
2. The plans have been revised to more clearly delineate the parking spaces which are intended to be banked.
3. The internal sidewalks north of Creekview Drive have been revised to be consistent with the sidewalk connections on Ranney Drive.

We believe the responses outlined above and the corresponding plan changes address the Planning Board's comments and your review comments.

We look forward to appearing before the Planning Board at its April 02, 2014 hearing. In the meantime if you should have any comments, questions or require additional information, please contact our office.

He gave a brief overview of the project. With him are Mike Montalto, Costich Engineering and Jim Barbato Sr. He reviewed the conditions of the 2/19/14 Planning Board meeting (see below) and described how they were all met.

1. The Town Board is to make a SEQR determination on the project.
2. Satisfaction of any remaining concerns of the DPW/CED.
3. The sidewalk plan is worked out between the applicant and the Town staff for both the area in front of the cemetery and plans to connect the sidewalk to the existing sidewalk of the fire hall.
4. Guest parking for the single family homes are to be identified on the plans.
5. The building elevations, light and colors are to be included on plans and the applicant is to consider alternative elevations and treatments for the single family homes to provide a variety of look, in addition to color.
6. The applicant to continue to work with Town staff and Crescent Trail to resolve any outstanding trail conditions.

The Town Board allowed the 3 story apartment buildings to have a 45' height. He described the guest parking and pointed out where they are on the plans. He reviewed the alternate elevations for the single family homes and there are 4 now. They are proposing the Crescent Trail to have a grass surface and they will mow and maintain if that is what the Crescent Trail would like.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from the Conservation Board. Mr. Salmon states that the Conservation Board is comfortable with the SEQR recommendation that they previously submitted to the Town Board.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from CED. Mr. Doser states that the Town Board granted a Negative Declaration of SEQR last week. They have added guest parking spaces. The parking meets Town Code. The application is consistent with the Town Comprehensive Plan and the Egypt Subarea Plan. The Planning Board should require the applicant to pay a \$850 per unit recreation fee, which is consistent with development in the Town of Perinton under Section 182-23. That is collected at the time of building permit.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from DPW. Mr. Kozarits states that DPW issued comments as follows:

DPW Comments:

General

1. **The applicant has acknowledged that the following items will be provided prior to obtaining Town signatures on the drawings:**
 - a. **Subdivision map recorded in Monroe County Clerk's office**
 - b. **Letter of Credit**
2. **Provide a note on drawing VA 100 and CA100 that states the soil data for test pits shown on the drawings are included in the geotechnical report prepared by Foundation Design dated July 2013.**
3. **On drawing CA100, revise the first sentence of the Clearing Note to read "...the clearing limits are *to be delineated* by the developers engineer".**
4. **The profile shown for SA 1.0 to SA 0.0 needs to be revised to match the appropriate section of sewer, and a profile for storm sewer D3.0 to D2.0 needs to be provided.**
5. **Revise the sanitary sewer pipe anti-seepage collar detail (on the lower right portion of drawing CA 520) to be constructed of bentonite instead of reinforced concrete. The anti-seepage collar for stormwater pond outfall pipes is ok to be constructed with reinforced concrete as shown.**
6. **Provide DPW copies of the approved shop drawings for the precast concrete culvert and wing walls. Add a note on the plans that inspection by the geotechnical engineer is required during the footing excavation to determine that the excavation is adequately dewatered and to re-evaluate the soils bearing capacity in the event a change in the footing design is required.**
7. **Applicant to ensure all discrepancies between SWPPP and plans for Pond 1A, Pond 1B and Pond 2 are resolved prior to Town signatures on drawings.**
8. **The applicant needs to provide an Access Easement to the Town of Perinton over Ranney and Creekstone Drives to allow for emergency vehicle access as well as access to adjoining easements.**

The technical issues have been addressed.

Mr. Beck states that the sidewalk construction from this project satisfies the requirement.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from Attorney Place. Mr. Place suggests making a separate motion regarding sidewalk construction and park fund contribution.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from the audience.

Mike Wisniewski, 41 Broadmoor Trail, questioned if the plans that were submitted to the Town, as far as landscaping and planting in the buffer area is what will actually happen. Mr. Anderson states yes.

Gail Damon, 40 Bent Oak Trail, questioned the visibility of the pool on Route 31. The applicant states that the cabana building acts as the screening. The building will look like a home.

Dorothy Jawk, 45 Broadmoor, inquires if the stub road will now be cleaned up as it is jammed with dead trees and leaves and the water is jammed up. Mr. Beck states that they will take a look at that.

Mr. Anderson thanks the applicant for being so cooperative during this long review process. The proposal is consistent with the Egypt subarea report and brings density that is wanted to the area. There is a need for senior. Housing and there is a demand for high end rental properties. He understands it's not for everyone. The additional elevations help to break up the appearance of the single family homes. The character of this area will change. It has a rural look and feel to it right now; this will change. He feels that this will blend in well and will be successful. He is prepared to go forward with preliminary and final site and subdivision.

Mr. Lewis asked how many rental units there will be. The applicant states 152 plus the assisted living. Mr. Lewis asks who will own the project and be responsible for maintenance. The applicant states that Pridemark will own and maintain all, except for the assisted living; they are selling the lot to the Presbyterian Home and they will own the facility. Mr. Lewis states that this project is dense and is that way by design; this is what the Town Board wants. He feels the stormwater issues will improve from what exists now. He is prepared to go forward with preliminary and final site and subdivision.

Mr. Brasley states that the application is consistent with the Town Comprehensive Plan and the Egypt Subarea Plan. He supports the project. He inquires what the colors are of the single family homes. The applicant states that they have a color scheme that they put together that was submitted to the HAC. There is a gray/dark gray, clay, wicker and cameo. Mr. Brasley asks who is in possession of the color scheme; the applicant states HAC. The applicant states that the site plan shows which unit will be what color. They took care to vary them. Mr. Brasley would like to see the approval from HAC and the date of that approval shown on the final plans.

Mr. O'Brien thanks the applicant for addressing the concerns of the neighbors, town staff, and various Boards over the years. He is prepared to go forward.

Mr. Gardner supports the density increase. He doesn't like the square/rectangular layout of the project.

Ms. Neu would like to see some low lying shrubbery surrounding the back and sides of some of the buildings (pointing). The applicant states that most homes have low lying shrubbery in the front; not the back. They mad add some pine trees on site as the buildings go up.

Bill Guche, 39 Broadmoor Trail, inquires when the project will start and when it will end. Mr. Anderson states that it will have to start within one year. The applicant states that he feels from the date the first C of O is issued to completion of project will be anywhere from 3 – 5 years; with the mass grading all done in the first phase. Mr. Beck states that they will have to grass it. Mr. Guche is concerned with aesthetics and it will look unsightly for years. Mr. Place states that the applicant is required to post a letter of credit which will protect the neighbors to insure that a project is either completed or removed; the Town has the same concern as the neighbors in that regard. Mr. Guche asked if the assisted living will be developed in Phase 1. The applicant states that they would like to start construction in the spring of 2015. Mr. Guche states that the berms are more contours and not berms. MR. Anderson states that the Board prefers contours, as a big mound is unnatural looking and difficult to plant on. They prefer the berms to have a rolling effect and the plantings survive better. Mr. Guche states that the contours will be about 1 – 2'. Mr. Anderson states that the intent of the berm is not to 100% shield; it is to soften the visual and provide separation.

Karilyn Hansen, 10 Conover Crossing, inquired what road the applicant will use for construction vehicles. The applicant states that Section 1 will utilize Route 31, however, both 31 and Mason will be used for the remainder. Ms. Hansen expresses concern to use Mason Road this way as there are a lot of runners and walkers.

A woman inquired when they would start plantings. The applicant states that they will be done in Sections as the project is built.

Gail Damon, 40 Bent Oak, inquires if they will add a sidewalk on Mason Road to Bent Oak. Mr. Beck states that eventually there will be. The Town and the school district are looking into obtaining a grant for that.

Tom Lucy, 5 Morning View, inquired if all of the berms would go in first. Mr. Anderson states that berms are done as part of the final grade. Mr. Lucy would like them in first so they have time to mature. The applicant states that they would not be able to do that as there would not be a water system in yet.

A man inquired if as they complete a building, will they build the berm. The applicant states yes. They are going to be trying to market the site and want it to look as good as possible. Mr. Beck adds that the Town can encourage the applicant to do this as the letter of credit will be in place.

A woman inquired what the distance is from one single family house to the other house in the back. The applicant states 60'. The three units are 40' apart. The porches are a part of the structure.

Mr. Anderson states that the Town Board already granted a Negative Declaration of SEQR.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to require the applicant to make a contribution to the Town Park fund for 152 units in an amount to be determined by the DPW to support and enhance recreational facilities as a result of adding this number of residences to the Town.

Mr. Lewis seconds the motion.

Motion carries 6 – 0.

Mr. Anderson states that the Board recognizes that the applicant is constructing a sidewalk on both Mason Road and extensions on Route 31, and this satisfies the Town requirement.

Mr. Brasley seconds the motion.

Motion carries 6 – 0.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to grant preliminary subdivision approval for a two lot subdivision for plans received by the Town on 3-14-14, subject to the following conditions:

1. Satisfaction of any remaining concerns of the DPW.
2. Shared access easements with the greenhouse units are subject to the satisfaction of the Town Attorney and Commissioner of DPW.

Mr. Lewis seconds the motion.

Motion carries 6 – 0.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to grant final subdivision approval for a two lot subdivision for plans received by the Town on 3-14-14, subject to the following conditions:

1. Satisfaction of any remaining concerns of the DPW.
2. Shared access easements with the greenhouse units are subject to the satisfaction of the Town Attorney and Commissioner of DPW.

Mr. Lewis seconds the motion.

Motion carries 6 – 0.

Mr. Brasley made a motion to grant preliminary site plan approval for a Planned Development District to develop a 39.9 acre parcel at the northeast corner of the intersections of Pittsford-Palmyra Road and Mason Road for a 160 unit residential development consisting of single family detached single story homes for rent, single story townhomes for rent, three apartment buildings with one and two bedroom units for rent, four Green House style assisted living homes, open space park amenity, two garage buildings for resident storage, a storage/maintenance garage for property management, and a community center, pool, cabana building and leasing office, for plans received by the Town on 3/14/14 and revised building elevations received by the Town on 3/24/14, subject to the following conditions:

1. This project consists of 26 single family homes, 60 ranch townhomes, and 66 apartment units, along with the green house style assisted living homes.
2. Satisfaction of any remaining concerns of the DPW.
3. The final sidewalk layout along Mason Road shall be subject to the review and approval of the Commissioner of DPW.
4. The single family homes shall have a variety of colors as approved by the Historic Architecture Commission in their Certificate of Appropriateness.
5. The applicant shall add additional foundation plantings at the rear and sides of the single family buildings and occasional evergreen trees between the buildings.
6. The applicant shall provide shared access easements between the two new created lots to the satisfaction of the Town Attorney and Commissioner of DPW.
7. The applicant shall show the date of the approval (2/11/14) of the Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Architecture Commission on the final plans.

The proposed development is in keeping with the 2003 Egypt Sub-Area Plan and Guidelines.

The proposal follows the general design guidelines, including higher density near the hamlet core, adequate landscape buffers between new and existing development, and attractive streetscapes, which include appropriate landscaping, lighting, sidewalks, and other pedestrian friendly assets.

The proposal also follows the recommended architectural guidelines for residential buildings in the hamlet, including appropriate garage orientation, appropriate massing and proportion of the buildings, inclusion of such architectural features as trim boards around doors, windows, and along fascia; porches; combination of clapboards and shingles on all buildings; and the attractive use of five color combinations for clapboards and shingles.

There is sensitivity shown with regard to the historic cemetery on Mason Road, including the utilization of appropriate landscaping and the establishment of the adjacent pocket park.

This meets the need for a variety of housing types and housing for seniors in the Town of Perinton.

Mr. Lewis seconds the motion.

Motion carries 6 – 0.

Mr. Brasley made a motion to grant final site plan approval for a Planned Development District to develop a 39.9 acre parcel at the northeast corner of the intersections of Pittsford-Palmyra Road and Mason Road for a 160 unit residential development consisting of single family detached single story homes for rent, single story townhomes for rent, three apartment buildings with one and two bedroom units for rent, four Green House style assisted living homes, open space park amenity, two garage buildings for resident storage, a storage/maintenance garage for property management, and a community center, pool, cabana building and leasing office, for plans received by the Town on 3/14/14 and revised building elevations received by the Town on 3/24/14, subject to the following conditions:

1. This project consists of 26 single family homes, 60 ranch townhomes, and 66 apartment units, along with the green house style assisted living homes.
2. Satisfaction of any remaining concerns of the DPW.

3. The final sidewalk layout along Mason Road shall be subject to the review and approval of the Commissioner of DPW.
4. The single family homes shall have a variety of colors as approved by the Historic Architecture Commission in their Certificate of Appropriateness.
5. The applicant shall add additional foundation plantings at the rear and sides of the single family buildings and occasional evergreen trees between the buildings.
6. The applicant shall provide shared access easements between the two new created lots to the satisfaction of the Town Attorney and Commissioner of DPW.
7. The applicant shall show the date of the approval (2/11/14) of the Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Architecture Commission on the final plans.

The proposed development is in keeping with the 2003 Egypt Sub-Area Plan and Guidelines.

The proposal follows the general design guidelines, including higher density near the hamlet core, adequate landscape buffers between new and existing development, and attractive streetscapes, which include appropriate landscaping, lighting, sidewalks, and other pedestrian friendly assets.

The proposal also follows the recommended architectural guidelines for residential buildings in the hamlet, including appropriate garage orientation, appropriate massing and proportion of the buildings, inclusion of such architectural features as trim boards around doors, windows, and along fascia; porches; combination of clapboards and shingles on all buildings; and the attractive use of five color combinations for clapboards and shingles.

There is sensitivity shown with regard to the historic cemetery on Mason Road, including the utilization of appropriate landscaping and the establishment of the adjacent pocket park.

This meets the need for a variety of housing types and housing for seniors in the Town of Perinton.

Mr. Lewis seconds the motion.

Motion carries 6 – 0.

Mr. Anderson states that the next step is the rezoning to PDD at the Town Board. Mr. Doser states that it will likely be on the last Town Board meeting in April (April 23, 2014).

New Application(s):

CVS – 1304 Fairport Road. Larson Design Group, et al., as agent for Anthony DiPrima, owner of property located at 1304 Fairport Road (tax id # 152.11-1-33) and Tony DiPrima Properties, LLC, owner of a portion of property located at 1314 Fairport Road (tax id #152.11-1-32), requesting final site plan approval to construct a new 13,225 sf retail pharmacy (CVS) and associated parking and site improvements.

Presenter: Larson Design Group
Zoned: Commercial

John Wojtila, Zaremba Group, presented the project to the Board as per letter of intent as shown below:



Larson Design Group

ary



March 13, 2014

Mr. Mark Anderson
Chairman
Town of Perinton Planning Board
1350 Turk Hill Road
Fairport, NY 14450

Re: *Letter of Intent for Final Site Plan Application*
CVS Perinton Store #10284
1304 Fairport Road
Town of Perinton, Monroe County, New York

Dear Mr. Anderson:

On behalf of the Zaremba Group we are formally requesting that the above-referenced project be considered for Final Site Plan Approval by the Town of Perinton Planning Board. As you are aware, the project obtained a SEQR Negative Declaration and Preliminary Site Plan Approval at the February 19th Planning Board Meeting.

We have received technical review letters in response to our January 2, 2013 Preliminary Site Plan Application. These letters include:

- D.P.W./C.E.D Letter to Planning Board from Thomas Beck dated January 31, 2014
- Monroe County Department of Planning and Development Response to referral PR14-1Z dated January 21, 2014
- Monroe County Development Review Committee Attachment to File PR14-1Z, dated January 21, 2014.

The following is an item-by-item response (bolded) to the comments that were issued:

January 31, 2014 D.P.W./C.E.D Letter to Planning Board

A. General:

1. *Letter of Credit:*
For the purposes of the required Letter of Credit, please find the attached engineers estimate for the proposed site work for this project.
2. *Cross-Access Easement*
The attached plans have been revised to show the existing easement on 1276 Fairport Road. In addition a proposed 24' wide access easement has been added to the revised Site Plan. A draft form of the easement has been received from the Town and has been sent to CVS and it's counsel for review.

3. *Relocate Transformer Pad and Dumpster Enclosure*
The attached plans have been revised to show the transformer pad and dumpster enclosure outside of the proposed easement.
4. *Property Line Bearings and Dimensions*
The property line bearings and dimensions provided in the ALTA survey are now shown in the site development plans. A final plat has not been prepared for the subdivision required by the extension of O'Connor Road. Those property lines will be shown graphically until the final legal information is available.
5. *Site Light Fixtures/Photometrics*
In response to the request by the Board, the height of the poles has been revised. The fixture height is 13'-8" and the max height to the top of the curved pole is 16'-5". The pole locations were adjusted accordingly to maintain the necessary light levels. A detail has been added and the drawing has been incorporated into the Site plan set. Separate sheets have been provided to show additional information on the specified fixtures.
6. *Unloading Area*
CVS has reviewed and approved this layout based on the fact that the facility will typically receive a maximum of one delivery per day during non-peak hours. Additionally the typical stacking distance for the pickup window is short. Based on this, little or no impact to the drive thru is anticipated.
7. *Compactor and Dumpster Enclosures.*
The revised submission includes an additional drawing (A-10) that shows details for both the dumpster and compactor enclosures. Both enclosures will be masonry to match the building.
8. *Landscaping Planting Schedule*
The landscape plan been corrected in the revised plan set to address the note discrepancies.
9. *Construction Fencing*
4 ft. high orange construction fencing, encompassing the entire site, has been added to drawing C1.01. A detail for the fencing has also been added to the set. A note on the fencing has been provided to require that this fencing be maintained throughout construction.
10. *Crosswalks*
As requested, the revised plans have eliminated the painted crosswalks, the concrete walk has been extended across the entrance drives, and the detectable warning fields has been removed.

11. *NYS DOT Highway Work Permit*

An initial application for a Highway Work Permit was submitted to NYS DOT on January 6, 2014. A signed permit will be forwarded upon receipt.

12. *Variances*

Applications for the required variances as well as a special use permit for the Drive-thru were submitted to the Town ZBA on January 24, 2014. These applications were approved at the February 24th meeting of the ZBA. The attached plans have been updated to indicate these approvals.

13. *Signature Block*

The revised plan set contains a signature block on all plan sheets.

14. *Snow Storage*

A snow storage area has been designated on the revised site plan drawing, C1.02.

15. *Coordination with O'Connor Road project*

The initial plan set included notes referencing the O'Conner Road Project on Drawing C1.01 and C1.03. In the revised set, General Note # 9 has been added to the Cover Sheet to reinforce this coordination both in terms of proposed improvements and construction schedule.

16. *G0.01 Note 9*

The referenced note has been revised to read "MUTCD Latest Edition"

17. *G0.01 Note 25*

The referenced note has been revised to require the sediment filter practice used during construction to be in compliance with NYSDEC Standards.

18. *C1.08 Note 7*

The noted references have been revised to read the Town of Perinton.

19. *Landscape Irrigation*

It is the intent of the developer to provide automatic irrigation on the site. The Landscape Plan has been revised to indicate which areas are to be irrigated. Typically this is handled as a performance specification item to be provided by the contractor. A permit will be obtained prior to construction.

20. *Symbols at Intersection*

The noted symbols at the southeast corner of the site near the intersection are not bollards but site lighting fixtures. They are labeled as a typical symbol on C1.02 and are also shown on the provided photometric plan. The revised plan has additional notes to clarify this.

21. *Truck Turning Path*
Drawing C1.02 has been revised to show the requested truck turning movements. A WB-62 truck is able to make the indicated turns within the proposed driveway entrance dimensions.
22. *Route 31F Intersection/Traffic*
During peak travel times, if queue lengths extend on 31F, CVS patrons have the option of using the O'Connor Road entrance. Additionally, the signalization at the intersection will provide satisfactory breaks or openings in traffic to enable satisfactory turning movements.
23. *MCWA Approval*
As requested, a note requiring approval and coordination with the Monroe County Water Authority for the service connection has been included as Note #1 on drawing C1.04.
24. *Installation and Maintenance of Street Trees*
The tree planting details on drawing C1.05 have been modified to include the Town's recommendations for staking and guying. A general note addressing the maintenance requirements and responsibilities for these trees has also been added.
25. *Pavement Design*
The noted inconsistencies in the pavement section details on drawing C1.07 has been corrected in the revised set of plans. The revised sections are consistent with the NYSDOT Region 4 Driveway Standards.
26. *Limits of New Sidewalk*
The limits of concrete sidewalk being constructed by the project have been revised as requested. A "By others" note has been added to the work at the northwest corner of the intersection along with a reference to Roadway Plan PL-1. The previous submission already included the exposed aggregate specification for the private walk section but it has been further clarified on the revised plan to be consistent with the walk installed as part of the O'Connor Road Project.
27. *Sidewalk Detail*
The sidewalk detail on drawing C1.07 has been revised per Town recommendations.
28. *Concrete Mix*
Project site detail sheets have been revised to specify the City of Rochester Class K Concrete Mix where applicable.
29. *Sign Post Detail*
The sign post detail has been revised to show the breakaway hardware above grade as requested.

30. *Hairpin Striping*

The hairpin striping has been revised to show closed off ends both in plan and the details.

31. *Subdivision plan*

It is the intent of the applicant to file a subdivision/consolidation plan for the project property once preliminary site plan approval has been obtained.

B. Grading/Erosion Control:

1. *Erosion Control Blanket*

Note 7c has been added to C1.06 requiring the specified erosion control blanket to be installed on all slopes 3:1 or steeper. The specific areas have been indicated on the plan. A similar note has also been included on the Grading Plan, C1.03, as requested.

2. *Erosion Control Legend*

The previous submission had a Legend for all symbols and abbreviations on drawing C1.01. As requested, the erosion and sediment control symbols have been moved from this legend to a separate legend on the Erosion Control Plan (Drawing C1.06).

3. *Required Fill*

Calculations for the cut/fill volumes required by the project have been added to the grading plan (Drawing C1.03)

4. *Additional Silt Fence*

Additional silt fence has been added to drawing C1.06 along the toe of slope along the north side of the property. The existing silt fence in the north west quadrant has been revised as requested.

5. *C1.03, Note 1*

As requested the first sentence of Note 1 has been removed.

6. *Contour Labels*

The noted contour labels on drawing C1.06 along the north edge of the property have been corrected.

C. Sanitary:

1. *Cleanouts*

An additional sanitary cleanout has been added on this lateral line to reduce the maximum distance between cleanout to less than 90 ft.

2. *Lateral Connection*

The lateral connection detail has been revised to utilize gasketed PVC fittings and require DPW notification prior to connecting to the municipal system.

3. *Curbing*

The noted curbing has been redesigned to avoid conflict with the existing sanitary manhole.

D. *Storm Drainage:*

1. *Catch Basin #13*

The noted 4' +/- sump on this structure was incorrect. The structure depth has been revised.

2. *Storm Structure Detail*

A detail for a typical storm inlet/catch basin structure has been added to the plans. Detail reference tags have been added for structures MH-1, MH-2, DD-1, and DD-2.

3. *Subsurface Detention System*

After consulting with DPW, additional details and sections of this system have been provided. Revisions include an additional water quality unit, more detailed elevation information, pipe inspection ports, increased size of final discharge pipe, additional material specifications, and filter fabric. Revised stormwater design calculations, reflecting these changes, are also included in this submission.

4. *Stormwater Control Structure*

Additional information, specific to the construction of the weir wall, has been added to the detail of structure MH#1 on drawing C1.10.

5. *Long Term Maintenance Requirements*

A note has been added to both the Utility Plan (C1.04) and Landscaping Plan (C1.05) regarding maintenance responsibilities and signed maintenance agreements for both the Stormwater system and the right-of-way plantings.

6. *Infiltration Basin*

A note has been added to the Erosion Control Plan (drawing C1.06) regarding the protection of the infiltration basin from sediment and the performance testing of the basin upon completion of construction.

E. CED Comments:

1. *September 25th Special Use Permit*
The applicant is in agreement with the conditions outlined in the Town Board's approval of the Special Use Permit.
2. *Required Zoning Variances*
Applications for the required variances as well as a special use permit for the Drive-thru were submitted to the Town ZBA on January 24, 2014. These applications were approved at the February 24th meeting of the ZBA. The attached plans have been updated to indicate these approvals.

MCDP&D Response to referral PR14-1Z dated January 21, 2014

Irondequoit Creek Watershed

The applicant has reviewed the IWC Developers Packet and is working closely with the Town DPW on the design of the stormwater management system for the project. We are confident that the proposed design meets both the intent of the Collaborative and NYSDEC SPDES requirements.

Monroe County DRC Attachment to File PR14-1Z, dated January 21, 2014.

1. *Water Supply*
 1. *Watermain Extension or Relocation*
The current design of the project does not require an extension or relocation of the water main. A combined water service connection is required. The applicant will obtain all necessary approvals for this connection.
 2. *Backflow Protection*
It is the expectation of the applicant that backflow protection will be required due to the proposed fire suppression system. Once preliminary Site Plan approval has been obtained, an initial application will be sent to the supplier of water.
2. *Monumentation*
It is not anticipated that the project will impact any County or State monumentation. The County Survey office will be contacted to confirm prior to filing the subdivision/consolidation map at the County Clerk's office.
3. *Traffic Data*
The applicant has not had any traffic data prepared for this project.
4. *Combining Drives*
An initial application for a Highway work permit for the entrance as currently proposed was submitted to NYSDOT on January 6, 2014. A resubmission of the same configuration was sent on March 4, 2014 in response to DOT comments. Additionally the applicant is working with the Town in granting the cross-access to the property to the west for access out to O'Connor Road.
5. *New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Jurisdiction*
It is our expectation that the only NYSDEC permit application required for the project will be for coverage under SPDES General Permit GP-0-10-001 for construction activity. Application will be made upon receipt of approval signatures of the local MS4 (Town of Perinton).

On 2/19/14, the Planning Board granted a Negative Declaration of SEQR and granted preliminary site plan approval to construct a new 13,225 sf retail pharmacy (CVS) and associated parking and site improvements, for plans received by the Town on 1/2/14, subject to the following conditions:

1. Satisfaction of any remaining concerns of the DPW.
2. Applicant to obtain all necessary variances and Special Use Permit(s) required from the Zoning Board of Appeals, and applicant to list the approvals and dates granted on the final plans.
3. This application includes no signage; signage is a separate application to the Planning Board.
4. Applicant shall provide a cross access easement to the parcel to the west to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Public Works and the Town Attorney.
5. All pole lights on this property shall be no higher than 16' from grade to the highest point on the fixture.
6. Applicant shall show details for both proposed dumpster enclosures, indicating that they are masonry enclosures with a maximum height of 8' above grade.
7. The applicant shall provide a 3 D image of the architectural renderings of the final elevations.
8. This approval includes a waiver of the front parking setback from 50' down to 20'; this is consistent with the approval granted for the Special Use Permit by the Town Board.

On 2/24/14, the Zoning Board of Appeals granted the following variances of the Town of Perinton Zoning Ordinance to allow a proposed CVS Pharmacy:

- (1) Section 208-42 (B) (2), to allow the lot width (Fairport Road) to be 161.27 feet instead of 300 feet.
- (2) Section 208-42 H, to allow the front landscape buffer along Fairport Road and O'Connor Road to be 20 feet instead of 50 feet.
- (3) Section 208-41 A (4) (a), to allow the drive-thru stacking to be 5 spaces instead of 10 spaces, all subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant to obtain a building permit within one year from meeting date.

The Zoning Board of Appeals granted a Special Use Permit under Section 208- 41 A(4) (a), to allow a drive-thru pick up window for a proposed CVS pharmacy, subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant to obtain a building permit within one year from meeting date.

He acknowledges recent comments from the DPW and sees no issue with them. He understands that signage is a separate application. The signage as shown on what the Board is reviewing on the site plan tonight is less than what was shown on the previous submittal; but they showed it so that the Board would know what they would be seeking in a future sign application. They realize it is beyond what the Code allows. They realize they need to obtain the cross access easement to the parcel to the west. The light poles are 16'5" top of the light pole fixture but with the curved feature; the light itself is down at 13'8".

Mike O'Connell, Larson Design Group reviewed the site revisions as per letter of intent. There are modifications to the crosswalks and striping based on comments. There have been modifications to the stormwater management system and calcs have been submitted to staff. He acknowledges receipt of DPW comments this past Friday. The sidewalk that they are building will now be entirely in the O'Connor Road ROW.

Mr. Anderson states that a Negative Declaration of SEQR was already determined at the 2/19/14 meeting.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from the Conservation Board and there were none.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from CED. Mr. Doser states that a significant amount of planning went into this plan by various Boards within the Town. Signs are not a part of this approval and are a separate application.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from the DPW. Mr. Kozarits states that the DPW issued comments as follows:

General

1. **The applicant has acknowledged that the following items will be provided prior to obtaining Town signatures on the drawings:**
 - a. **Re-subdivision map combining all parcels into a single parcel recorded in Monroe County Clerk's office**
 - b. **Copy of NYSDOT highway work permit for driveway connection to Rte 31F**
 - c. **Letter of credit for all site work to be completed on this project**
 - d. **Proposed irrigation system will require permit from the Town Code Enforcement Department**
 - e. **Standard Town and Agency signature lines/blocks shall be included on the drawings.**
2. **Remove the ground mounted signs shown on the plans as they are not part of this approval.**
3. **Change driveway entrances from radius type to apron type to be consistent with others along Fairport Rd and O'Connor Rd. We have provided the applicant's engineer with an apron entrance detail.**
4. **Dumpster enclosure details (drawing A-10) should be bound with the site plans and other details.**
5. **Remove corner of concrete pad for dumpster from within the access easement and pave area with heavy duty asphalt concrete instead.**
6. **The existing sanitary lateral to the former 7-11 Building needs to be removed to the Fairport Road right of way and capped with a watertight plug.**
7. **On the landscaping plan, correct note 4 to read "...Responsibility of Owner".**
8. **On the erosion and sediment control plan, modify the construction sequence to state that the infiltration basin will be constructed after site pavement areas are up to subbase stone.**
9. **Adjust the sidewalk alignment along O'Connor Road so that it is completely within the right of way**
10. **The proposed Access Easement needs to be submitted for review by the DPW and the approved easement needs to be provided along with a check to the Monroe County Clerk for the filing fee prior to Town approval signatures being affixed to the plans.**

He asked if the State DOT has provided any feedback regarding consolidated driveway. The applicant states that they have submitted some data to them and have not had any comment back yet. Mr. Beck states that he spoke with Dave Gehring and they will be ok without the shared access. Mr. Kozarits states that water quality and quantity have been addressed.

Mr. Beck states that the construction of a sidewalk that they are proposing will satisfy the Town sidewalk requirement.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from Attorney Place, and there were none.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from the audience, and there were none.

Ms. Neu states that signage is shown on the site plan, and inquires about the process going forward if signage is a separate application. Mr. Anderson states that the Planning Board is not approving any signage as part of site plan. The applicant was

asked to remove signs from the site plan. Mr. Anderson states that the applicant has submitted and is showing renderings of the site plan that show signage on them. The Board is not approving any signage as part of site plan tonight. Any signage is required to be a separate application to the Planning Board.

Mr. Gardner does not like the layout of the project; it has an address on Fairport Road. The delivery trucks that come to this site need to know that they cannot enter off of Fairport Road. The first truck that comes in there will drive down backwards in the drive-thru lane. Anyone parked in the first parking spot will stop traffic to get out of the site. IT will be almost impossible and very disruptive to the traffic. The signage is inappropriate that is shown on the site plans. He feels it should be more stone like; the Summit Federal Credit Union sign looks nice and will make this more of a cornerstone property. He doesn't support the application and doesn't feel the site works well.

Mr. O'Brien supports the project and is prepared to go forward.

Mr. Brasley supports the project and feels it will be a great improvement to the Fairport Road corridor. He is comfortable with the elevations and the layout that the Town Board approved as part of their Special Use Permit. He would like to see the date the Town Board granted the Special Use Permit on the final plans. Mr. Brasley inquired if the two lots would be combined. The applicant states that it was a condition of approval. Mr. Place states that cross access easements will be needed. Mr. Beck states that the two buildings were on one lot and they purchased a small piece of property recently. Mr. Brasley feels that the cross access easement to the parcel to the west is essential.

Mr. Lewis feels that the cross access easement to the parcel to the west is essential. He inquires why so many variances are being requested. Mr. Doser states that the property is zoned Commercial right now; the Town is proposing for this area to be rezoned to mixed use and once the property is rezoned the setbacks will be in conformance. If the mixed use Code were in effect right now, they would not need these variances. Mr. Lewis inquired when that will happen. Mr. Doser states that the Town is in the process right now. Mr. Lewis states that signs are a separate application. He would like the applicant to submit a sign application that meets code.

Mr. Anderson states that obtaining the cross access easement is important for good ingress and egress. There is a need for a pharmacy in this part of Town and will help to spur additional development. Monument signs are not allowed in a mixed use district and this Board will not look favorably on a variance to allow it.

Mr. Anderson made a motion that the Planning Board recognizes that this plan shows construction of a sidewalk, which satisfies the Town requirement for a sidewalk contribution.

Mr. O'Brien seconds the motion.

Motion carries 6 – 0.

Mr. Brasley made a motion to grant final site plan approval to construct a new 13,225 sf retail pharmacy (CVS) and associated parking and site improvements for plans received by the Town on 3/14/14, subject to the following conditions:

1. Satisfaction of any remaining concerns of the DPW.
2. The applicant shall file a re-subdivision map to combine all parcels on this project into one lot with the Monroe County Clerk's Office prior to obtaining final signature to the satisfaction of the Town Attorney.
3. The applicant shall provide a cross access easement to the parcel to the west to the satisfaction of the Town Attorney and Commissioner of Department of Public Works.
4. Signage is a separate application and any signage that is shown on the plans being approved tonight is not valid and applicant must return to the Planning Board with a sign application.
5. The Planning Board strongly encourages the applicant to submit a sign application that meets the Town of Perinton Code and that requires no variances.
6. Applicant to show the Special Use Permit and the date (9/25/13) it was granted by the Town Board on the final plans.

Ms. Neu seconds the motion.

Motion carries 5 – 1, with Mr. Gardner opposed.

Discussion:

Minutes – 3/5/14

Mr. Lewis made a motion to approve the minutes of 3/5/14 as submitted.
Mr. Gardner seconds the motion.
Motion carries 5 – 0 with one abstention of Mr. O'Brien due to absence.

Minutes 3-19-14

Mr. O'Brien made a motion to approve the minutes of 3/19/14 as amended.
Mr. Brasley seconds the motion.
Motion carries 6 – 0.

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 8:50 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lori L. Stid, Clerk