

Minutes of the Town of Perinton
Conservation Board and
Historic Architecture Commission
Joint Meeting of May 14, 2013

Present:

Ken Rainis, Chairman
Chris Fredette
Andy Rodman
Bob Salmon
Jerry Leone
Sandra Neu
Joan Cannon

Absent:

John Minichiello
Dave Belaskas
Barb Wagner

Present:

Ann Parks, HAC
James Fassanella, HAC
Barb Clay, HAC Clerk
Bill Poray, Town Historian

Mike Doser, CED

Mark Costich, Jim Barbato, Sr.,
Jim Barbato, Jr.,
Christopher Lopez, Architect

Creekstone Discussion – Rezoning Request – Planned Development District.

Jim Barbato, Jr., gave the following overview of the project. This is a transitional zoning piece from traditional single family detached houses to the more dense core of the industrial land uses. The Town Comprehensive Plan designates this property as medium density residential which is 6-8 units per acre. We are well under that as far as the overall density. The Sub-area planning gives us more clearly defined density within the project as well as buffering. We have followed the Sub-area plan in many ways and have created a buffer along the Broadmoor homes as well as the Wolfboro homes respecting those single family residences. We have also added bungalows which are single family homes. Working through the project and how the area planning designates the different sub-areas, the plan known as density residential is 3-6 units per acre. There will be 26 ranch bungalows with open floor plans, 2-3 bedrooms each, 1,400 sq.ft. -1,600 sq.ft. with rentals of \$1,700 to \$2,000 per month. The next area is the planned residential medium which is the townhouse section that is ranch style homes. There will be 60 homes in five-unit buildings for a total of twelve buildings in the project. They are two bedroom, two bath with attached two car garage and are 1,300 sq.ft.-1,400 sq.ft with the rental range anticipated is \$1,400 to \$1,600 per month.

The architecture of the bungalows and the townhouses are a traditional design and we plan to follow a historical color palette as designated in the sub-area guidelines and will vary with four color combinations. We are looking at wrap around porches that present themselves to the street for an historical feel. There will be 66 apartment homes in three-22 unit buildings. Each building will have 12 garages. The buildings will be three-story with an elevator as we want to cater to seniors and empty nesters on all three floors. The sub-area plan also has an area for planned residential business or light commercial on Route 31 adjacent to Northern Nurseries and that is where the Community Center will be located. We have tried to tie in some of the architectural elements in the area. The Center will be about 5,000 sq.ft. with an outdoor pool and cabana building. There will be a lounge area and gathering space for social functions, rental and administrative offices for the community. There will be a fitness center with exercise equipment and an area for a flex room. The opportunity is very good because of where we are located, to put a very nice looking building as you enter the Hamlet of Egypt.

Regarding the side that faces our parking area, we plan to give a similar treatment and feel facing Route 31 as we understand that is very important. The proposal also includes four green house style assisted living homes that we will develop but the several small parcels will be sold to Rochester Presbyterian Homes. There are four ranch style homes approximately 8,500 sq.ft. each consisting of 12 bedrooms and bathrooms.

One of the key concerns of the neighbors is the traffic issue. A traffic study has been done by SRF Associates based on a scope that was provided to us by the Town. It showed there would be no drop in the current level of service or impact from this development. The study was reviewed by Erdman which was recommended and hired by the Town to review the study for accuracy. It was also approved by NYS – DOT.

Changes have been made from the previous plan as we have reduced the number of units from 174 to 160 or 8%. The overall density with the wetlands in it is four units per acre. If you eliminate the wetlands it is 4.9 units per acre. The reduction of units was primarily with the apartment units. The green houses were located near the Broadmoor homes but we have relocated them to an area that on the sub-area plan calls for residential business. When we relocated them, we were able to pull the entire project back away from Mason Road and allow for a much larger buffer. There is a small area where we might be able to create a small pocket park where we can put some benches and bike racks. It is also an opportunity to tie into the Trail system which runs along the creek and then flows into the project. We also relocated the apartment buildings so that they are tucked in near the wetland. The buildings are a little taller than the others but they are sitting in the lowest area to minimize the impact to surrounding neighbors. The roads have been aligned for more of a straight line so they look more like a village style. The road network has been worked to avoid traffic. The project will be built in three phases with the last phase being the Presbyterian Home and that will depend on their timing as they have to get through the approval process with the State.

We plan on creating a very pedestrian friendly community with sidewalks, the trail system etc. The proposed roads are private roads and we will maintain them.

Ann Parks indicated the HAC's main concern is that you follow the Egypt plan and it appears that you are doing that. We will be interested in the details regarding the Community Center looking from Route 31. Also, it is noted that you are respecting the cemetery with additional space surrounding it. Mr. Fassanella asked about the parking lot, and Mr. Barbato stated that they still have to address that issue.

Sue O'Leary asked about the maintenance barn and if you have to go out to Mason Road to go into the development and Mr. Barbato replied "yes". The plan for that is not all maintenance for us but also for the residents who might need some extra storage. One of the main functions would be for mower and lawn equipment.

Ken asked about the Trail system and Mr. Barbato stated they have granted a temporary easement of the property to Crescent Trail until we move in and develop it. Once we develop it we will preserve that Trail.

Sandra asked about the dates for the various phases and Mr. Barbato replied that depends on the various approvals but they would like to start as soon as possible. Phase I would be built as it is absorbed. The absorption rate from our market studies indicates it would be about two – three years to complete the project.

Andy asked about lighting and Mr. Barbato stated they will be 12' poles. Andy also wondered about the green houses and Mr. Barbato replied that they will be for assisted living and not skilled nursing. Employees would park in the same area as visitors as there are only three employees per house during the day time. There will be two employees at night.

Bob asked about the percentage of green space and Mr. Barbato did not know but would find out. Mr. Costich indicated the building coverage is 12%. Ken asked about the percentage of impervious surface and Mr. Costich replied it was not greater than 65%. Bob asked about visitor parking and Mr. Barbato indicated the townhomes have two car garages and room for two cars in every driveway. There are a couple of spots at the end of each townhouse road for additional parking. There is adequate parking for visitors around the apartments. Bob asked about the ponds and Mr. Costich said they discharge to the stream and wetlands north of the complex. There are four ponds and we need at least two ponds given the fact there is a stream bisecting the site and we cannot convey storm water through that. It works out well to have the storm water management adjacent to the wetland buffer area. The soils are not conducive to infiltration (C & D type soils). There are some A & B soils that we can utilize throughout to allow for some green practices. We will be having grass swales along the perimeters of the site for water quality. The stream is a very large stream in a 750 acre watershed. Our site, area wise, represents about 4%-5% of the actual watershed. Once we complete our storm water practices, there will be very little impact. We are totally avoiding the wetlands, stream corridor and buffers. The peak runoff rate will be less than what it is currently.

Jerry asked if there were any plans for fencing along the corridors adjacent to the development. Jim Barbato indicated that they plan on berming and landscaping. An archeological study will be done at a future date. Jerry asked about preservation or security plans for the cemetery. Mr.

Barbato said they did not have any plans other than maintaining the property around it. We are open to any suggestions.

Chris questioned the height of the light poles and Jim Barbato said he would double check whether it is 10' or 12'.

Ken asked if there was a planned access to the wetland and if not encouraged him to try to develop that infrastructure so that people are aware of it as an amenity. Ken asked that they summarize how this project meets both the Town Comprehensive Plan and the Egypt Sub Area Plan. Mr. Barbato reiterated that we are transitioning the property from single family residential to Industrial. We are following the area guidelines as to architectural treatments, the road layouts etc. The Town's Comprehensive Plan shows how the demographics are shifting towards seniors, baby boomers and empty nesters and we are creating this diversity of housing. Andy asked about bike traffic as bikes are not allowed on the Crescent Trail. He suggested that they work closely with Crescent Trail folks to make it challenging for bikes to get on and off the trail.

Ken asked about the watershed and any impacts to it. Mr. Costich stated that when they look at drainage and storm water we look at existing conditions first. We look at the type of soils and in this case, the more clay soils the more runoff there will be under existing conditions. This creates more runoff and in this instance as the existing conditions mimic pavement. We look at water coming onto the site and we will not be treating it. We will leave it alone and let it pass through. We intend to keep the features as it exists today. There are no plans to channelize the stream. We will be doing some earth moving on the site but we will be working to balance the site. Also, the ponds help generate material to use for fill on the site. We look at the soils, and the off-site watersheds which are fairly minimal because eliminating the stream (we are not touching it), the surrounding watersheds are not much. Our watershed is really our site. The wetland itself has water quality benefits together with storm water detention and reduces flooding downstream.

There will be an extensive landscape plan, open swales and roof leaders will probably be connected. Instead of putting all that water from a roof into a pipe and having it flow elsewhere, we intend to put it into swales. We don't want to do that everywhere because we don't want to create hazards. We will be using some forms of bio-retention. Ken confirmed with Mr. Costich that the ingress of water from outside of the development area through the stream is essentially going to be left unhampered. Mr. Costich agreed with the statement. There will be some limited use of rain gardens because of the soils.

Mike Wisnewski of 41 Broadmoor Trail asked if those ponds will always have water in them and Mr. Costich replied "yes" as it is the design criteria of the State. We try and design them so that the water does move through them and does not stagnate. The neighbors have concern that if the water does not flow, it will become a breeding ground.

Sue O'Leary of Conover Crossing stated that there is a retention pond nearby. It is dry many times and when it is not it will fill up to the top level and it smells. There are cattails and all types of algae growth. Mr. Costich said that cattails are a very invasive species that no one

wants in their pond but it is hard to avoid having them. He can't tell you that he can come up with a new innovative way to solve the problem. Unfortunately, we don't have leeway anymore when it comes to pond design. They have to be done according to State standards. Sue asked if their pond would be like hers and Mr. Costich indicated he did not know the specifics of her pond design. Ken noted that these ponds have not been designed yet. Ken asked how deep these ponds might be and Mr. Costich indicated 2'-4'. We can't convey water from the west to the east and from the south to the north very well. We will be able to convey it because of the slope but many areas are flat.

Joel Jacobs, 45 Broadmoor Trail asked why they are not considering aerators to keep the water moving in the Turk Hill Road ponds. Mr. Costich felt they are more aesthetic ponds and are meant to be ponds for people's enjoyment. I don't think they were meant to be storm water management ponds. State regulations don't recommend or encourage mechanical devices. Mr. Jacobs noted that the "rain gardens" on Route 31 are now ponds, brown in color and stagnant. Why should we believe that these four ponds will be any different? Mr. Costich reiterated that rain gardens are a good thing in the right place. The soils are not real conducive to rain gardens here and why we won't be doing a lot of them. They are not meant to discharge but rather the water is meant to perc into the ground. Mr. Jacobs wanted to know what assurance they have once these ponds are approved and we won't have bug generators. Ken stated that the wetlands will generate bugs. The issue is managing the water so it doesn't stagnate and we won't know that until the applicant submits their design. This will be reviewed very carefully. They have to handle the water coming off the impervious surface being generated on the site and the other water passing through the site. No one wants conditions that make it an eyesore. Mr. Costich stated they want it to be an amenity to the project and we don't want to create any less of an environment for future tenants. These ponds will take on a wetland characteristic as they are adjacent to a wetland and it has water in it. That is good for water quality.

Mr. Costich reiterated that this development represents 4%-5% of the water shed and we will do our part. I can't say that we are going to change dramatically the flow characteristics of the creek. Based on tonight's comments, Ken asked what the impact is on the water into the area in a rain event and is there anything that can be done to mitigate any other issues. Mr. Costich confirmed that there is no planned incursion to what is there now. Ken further noted the stream goes towards the back end of the property and adds to the issue. Mr. Jacobs said that water has to be released either through the ponds or into the creek and the creek will not handle a rain storm now without flooding a lot of the properties in that area. Something needs to be done to mitigate that increased flow. Mr. Costich replied that is exactly what they propose to do. While the soils are not good for infiltration, the development has less of an impact because of the soils being fairly impervious. Water runs off now so when we create pavement or buildings, we are not changing it as much as if it were a sandy site.

Ken informed the audience that the CB has been asked by the Town Board to give a recommendation as to the suitability of this design. The CB will consider the following.

- 1) The project has been carefully considered and the applicant has given an excellent presentation.

- 2) The basic design characteristics of the Town's Master Plan and Sub Area Plan have been addressed.
- 3) The architectural treatment and design of the roads, lighting and positioning of various structures are excellent.
- 4) The applicant has taken into consideration the watershed and any impacts it may have.
- 5) The wetland area has been placed in an area adjacent to another major wetland area.
- 6) Water will be pre-treated within the wetland confines both on this site and adjacent to this site.
- 7) The applicant understands the major challenges the neighbors have talked about and will address them in the overall plan and design.
- 8) The comments about extensive landscaping are excellent. The use of berming and swales is an excellent way to achieve mitigation from water movement.
- 9) The CB would like to see a plan for landscaping including the stream.
- 10) The applicant has been sensitive to surrounding properties in terms of zoning.
- 11) The applicant is incorporating the amenity of the trail system and it will be a positive for visitors and residents.
- 12) The cemetery is being respected.

Ken again stated that this recommendation to the Town Board is for rezoning only and its use. The intent is to provide the applicant general feedback before they start investing time, energy and money on a specific plan. Mike Doser confirmed that this hearing is for the purpose of determining whether this project has enough merit to go forward for a Planned Development District. If the Town Board determines that it does, then it will proceed with a public hearing and go before Planning Board for site approvals.

Discussions:

Planning Board Report – 5-1-13 – Barb Wagner and Chris Fredette attended.

Stonebrook Subdivision – South of Route 31 between Thayer and Loud Roads – Longwell has submitted new historic names to the county; is waiting to hear back. Traffic studies show no significant impact. CB has already made SEQR recommendation to TB. Chris re-stated our support for notes on plan specifying handling of wastes, if encountered during construction, as well as for the plan's avoidance of LDD. Mike Doser noted responsiveness of plan to current demographic trends in Perinton. Mark Anderson asked whether previously approved amenities were still on the plan. Ryan confirmed that they are. Mark stated support for the types of duplexes (which appear similar to single family homes) proposed. Jim Brasley asked whether sufficient parking is provided including times when people might have gatherings involving more than the 4 cars per house accommodated in garages/driveways. Conclusion – sufficient overflow parking provided on public and private streets.

Preliminary and final approvals given, with conditions including: HAC be referred for final review of commercial building and any signs along Route 31; return to PB for final approval of commercial building elevations; obtain SUP from TB; signs are a separate application.

Messer Subdivision – 27 Waterworks Lane – Glen Thornton states that the soils do not perc and, therefore, dry wells will not be used. Neighbor asks whether soils in the area of the former leach fields will be adequate to support foundations. GT states that foundations there will bear on native soils. Abandonment of septic will be done in accordance with County requirements. Chris asked for confirmation that perc tests have been done and for results. GT confirmed, as of an additional set of tests today. Chris asked for note requiring 6” of topsoil during restoration. GT states that the note is already on the plan. Chris requested that it be shown clearly.

Neg. Dec. and Preliminary and Final approvals given with condition: Pool removal and site work to be completed prior to construction.

Tops Fuel Facility – 6720 Pittsford Palmyra Road – In regard to CB’s questions, TOPS stated that:

- 1) They will make it part of their daily inspection to check the catch basin and add water if needed.
- 2) They will revise operations manual to reflect NYSDEC requirements for spill response and to correct typos.

Tom Beck requested a letter of credit for construction and another letter of credit for removal of station if abandoned. Response: It is already a condition of the lease. Lou Tarragnoli (TOPS) – a letter of credit is a nightmare for TOPS. He would like PB to consider that their lease requires that everything be removed. FYI – The Plaza is in the process of considering updates to mall elevations.

SEQR Neg Dec; Preliminary and Final approvals given with conditions including: List on plans date of revised SUP; note agreement to monitor o/w separator water level; include approved elevations; changed signage; operations manual to be revised and revised manual submitted to CB.

Minutes:

The Conservation Board Minutes of April 16, 2013 and April 30, 2013 were approved as corrected.

Planning Board Meeting – 5-15-13 – Bob Salmon and Chris Fredette to attend.

Hall to VanBuren – 290 Howell Road – requesting preliminary and final subdivision approval to subdivide existing 1.8 acre parcel into two parcels. The CB has no environmental concerns.

1135-1157 Fairport Road – Site plan modification. Requesting preliminary and final site plan approval for modification of site plan previously approved on 11/17/10 for relocation of dumpster enclosure and modification of landscaping. The Board has no further environmental concerns.

Planning Board Meeting – 6-5-13 - Bob Salmon and Andy Rodman to attend.

14 Thayer Woods – Cain – Requesting preliminary and final site plan approval to construct a 2730 sq.ft. single family home in a residential sensitive district. Andy will review and Board will discuss at next meeting.

Bushnell’s Basin Sidewalk Project – CB made the following recommendation for a Neg.Dec to the Town Board for the following reasons:

- 1) The project will not impact wetland or steep sloped areas.
- 2) The project is consistent with and will support the Perinton Comprehensive Plan and the 2006 Bushnell’s Basin Canal Access Plan for increased pedestrian circulation throughout the Hamlet of Bushnell’s Basin.
- 3) The project design will assure that pedestrians are protected from vehicular traffic along NYS Route 96 by providing a green space area between the edge of the road shoulder and the edge of the new concrete sidewalk.
- 4) The project will provide a safe method for pedestrians to cross NYS Route 96 by constructing a mid-block pedestrian cross-walk.
- 5) It is not anticipated that any structures, monuments, or a significant number of trees will be impacted, removed or altered as a result of this project. The project will enhance the existing character and charm of the community with the look of newly constructed concrete sidewalks.

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joan M. Cannon, Secretary