

Minutes of the Town of Perinton  
Conservation Board Meeting of

August 6, 2013

Present:

Ken Rainis, Chairman  
Chris Fredette  
Barb Wagner  
Andy Rodman  
Jerry Leone  
Joan Cannon, Secretary

Absent:

John Minichiello  
Dave Belaskas  
Bob Salmon

Others Present:

Creekstone Development

Mike Montalto and Jim Barbato

**Creekstone Development – (Pride Mark Homes) Planned Development District**

Mr. Montalto was present tonight to discuss the 39.9 acres of land including storm water management. This is a multi-building residential unit comprised of 48 buildings; 26 single family units, 12 townhouse units; 3 apartment buildings; 4 greenhouses; a maintenance building and clubhouse cabana and pool providing 160 living units for the entire development.

Of the 39.9 acres, 31.88 acres will be developed. Of that, 13.2 acres of impervious surface between buildings etc. will be developed. The resulting green space is about 67% with 1.4 acres of storm water facilities. The end result is about 17 acres of lawn, landscaping and general green space. There are approximately 8 acres of wetland and stream corridor within the property.

There are three, small water management facilities proposed and they are primarily conventional wet ponds. In the area north of the existing creek, it primarily drains to the two small water management facilities adjacent to the wetland. We are not discharging anything back to the creek. The area between Route 31 and the creek drains to the north. The two storm water management facilities are interconnected with equalization piping with a single discharge point toward the creek. We have prepared cross sections of all three storm water management facilities. The embankments are 1/3 ½ slope and are created for the storm water management facilities. A cross section of all three storm water management facilities has been prepared. Because of the adjacency of the wetlands, we can't be submerging pipes. The storm water outfalls are primarily at the existing ground level.

There is an existing creek crossing where a pipe has been stuck in the creek corridor. The intent is to remove the creek corridor and put in an arched pipe to restore the stream corridor to its original width and natural vegetation. Basically, we will be restoring that portion of the creek and crossing the stream with the arched pipe. We have met with the DPW and reviewed concerns regarding the overall drainage patterns in the area and problems that have occurred over the years with the creek. Further analysis will be done with drainage studies information that has been provided. There is a berm that was constructed before the wooden bridge where the Crescent Trail crosses over. The stream corridor is not as well defined and is relatively shallow and is an area where the water overflows and spreads out. It

appears that from time to time storm water gets outside of the berm that was created and doesn't have a chance to return back to the creek. The roadway elevation proposed replicates where the elevation of the berm is placed. Between the disconnected roofs and tree plantings, we are doing an apartment parking lot area where we will sheet flow the drainage to a filter strip that is on the west side of the parking lot. Where it seems practicable, we try to take storm water out of the conventional pipe systems. The soil survey indicates that the soils are not good. The upper layers are fairly well drained but then it gets parched. We are fairly confident that we won't have ponding water.

Jerry wondered if they could prepare a sketch of the arched pipe so the Board could see what the structure looked like. Mike stated they pour a footer on either side of the stream corridor and set up a prefabricated concrete arch section. The arch section can be placed high enough so it crosses the roadway or it could have fill. The road is planned to be 6'-7' higher than the existing grade. We did not want to disturb the stream corridor – we want the stream to flow. Jerry asked if the 6'-7' grade was the current water. Mike indicated it was the grade of the existing topography. When the road comes through, we are coming up and over the stream corridor.

John asked about the drainage evaluation. Mike indicated they just met with the Town staff and we are working on it. We are looking at the entire watershed area that drains through the site because of the problems downstream. We want to make sure our development has no impact downstream and to make sure we don't have problems with the creek as it presently flows through our site. In the areas where the existing berm is, the stream channel is very well defined. As you get closer to the scrub, the channel is not very well defined. It is very shallow and wide and you can see where it is overflowed its banks. We have the drainage study but we are doing some spot topography and we need to provide that data. John asked about soils studies. Mike replied that a report has been done by Foundation Design. Even during earth work operations, we are told that if we time things correctly, we will be more successful. We are looking at a single phase project from a mass earth work standpoint. The goal is to balance the site with only on site materials. The overall development is occurring at the same kind of lines within the site. If it slopes down and in, it will still slope down and in. We are taking some of the exaggerations that occur and making things transitional. We do not intend to change the character or overall hydrology from a grading standpoint. Chris asked about basements. Mike indicated that most of them will be slab on grade. Some of the single family units will have walk-out basements.

As far as the wetland, John asked if they have looked at what is feeding the wetland. Is this construction going to have some effect on it? Mike stated they are keeping the area drainage patterns. Instead of one storm water facility, we have two with the intent to redistribute that source and maintain the hydrology. Barb asked about channelizing and will it be more than what is there now. Mike said there are certain areas that they have to look at and if we need to alter our grades. Once the modeling is completed, we will know more. However, our plan has always been to stay out of the stream corridor.

Ken confirmed with Mike that currently there is a fairly significant stenosis in the channel, so modeling will assume that it is removed and you expect with that alone a better capability of flow in the corridor. Mike replied that we are going to model it the way it is today and what the affect is of taking it out. Ken asked if the LDD ordinance for streams and 10' from top of slope has been preserved. The plans do not indicate that it has been. The CB would like to see a plan that makes the stream corridor an amenity for the people. The big impact is the effect on the watershed and any future presentation should have that in mind.

Chris noted that there has been flooding and is there any way this development can alleviate some of the problem. Mike stated that they are trying to go beyond the basic storm water regulations required by law; in particular, the rain events.

Bob asked if they would do the grading first and then the utilities. Mike indicated they would do the mass grading first and then they will phase in the project. The first phase will probably be from Route 31 to the creek; the second phase will be the main road, the apartments, townhouses and single family houses; the Rochester Presbyterian Home will be an independent phase. It will probably take about three years. Bob stated he was at Aldrich Road as well as Mason Road when we experienced two significant rain events (5-28 and 7-5) and that really comes up quick. He views that as a significant problem especially where it crosses a homeowner's driveway on Aldrich Road. Even prior to this problem there is a significant problem and it probably drains Broadmoor as well as Royale Drive on that side of Aldrich. Tom Beck indicated that part of the problem is the lack of grade on Aldrich Road. There is no easy fix.

Andy asked about snow storage and the flow of melting snow leaving the area. Mike stated everything is graded away from the site and will surface drain. Mike did not think that piles of snow would act as a dam.

Jerry asked about the landscaping along the eastern edge and asked for clarification as to height of trees and species. Mike stated the fringe of the storm water management facilities will have a wild flower mix and meadow grass. There is a combination of trees being planted and everything that is being proposed is 2 ½-3" caliper. From an evergreen standpoint the intent is to plant 5-6' trees.

Mike indicated they will put a better delineation of the Crescent Trail on the plans once we do the stream corridor portion. Jim Barbato stated that based on many conversations, we will try and maintain it within the existing stream corridor. Mike stated that the Corps has delineated the wetland buffer.

The parking is primarily according to code but there are some extra parking spaces. Dave asked about the number of people in each of the greenhouses. Mike stated there are 12 bedrooms in every green house. Some of them are non-drivers. The lighting on the road leading between the two developments will be 12' poles with the light shining down. The lighting levels are low at ½ candle. The apartments are the tallest structures in the complex at three stories high.

Ken asked if there was a 10 year rain event, and the project has been developed, will there be ponding in the grass areas around the buildings. Mike stated "no". If you look at the slope and the 1/5 contours away from the buildings together with a swale at 1% it won't pond. There may be some water in a swale after a rain event, but that's what a drainage conveyance is for. We are not creating individual lawn with its own drainage area. Ken had concern regarding the soils and perching in a 10 year rain event. Mike replied that they are filling in the area where the soil tends to perch more. We are not adding anything to the site, possibly a little less. Ken felt the modeling and the calculations need to demonstrate that.

Mike stated that they are working with Town staff and after we develop the model, we will submit further information.

Ken stated that he and John will liaison with the DPW and as you develop data and the model, we will discuss it with the rest of the Board. This is the last area to be developed and it is not fair to expect you

to fix everything. You have stated that we are not going to contribute any more. However, there are other mitigating issues that are a concern. Ken felt that the bridge is an excellent proposal as the soil types are not great. My understanding is that you will let some infiltration occur and let it run away underground. Hopefully that can work.

**Discussions:**

The Conservation Board minutes of 7-16-13 were approved as corrected.

**Planning Board Report – 7-17-13 – Chris Fredette and Andy Rodman attended.**

**Re-subdivision of 815 Furman Road. (Lot 6 Bortle Homestead Subdivision)** requesting preliminary and final subdivision approval. PCB SEQR neg dec recommendation and Preliminary and final subdivision approvals given. Conditions included: Placement of orange fencing around the LDD patch during construction; the Conservation Easement which expires in 2014 be removed or construction delayed; engineering detail be supplied of the retaining wall; possibility of a common drive for several of the parcels be explored.

**Whisperwood Estates Lot R-14 resubdivision – requesting preliminary and final subdivision approval.** PCB SEQR neg dec recommendation and Preliminary and Final subdivision approvals given. There was no need for a Crescent Trail easement because this proposed parcel line does not extend to the area of the existing trail. Conditions included: concerns of the DPW be addressed; an easement must be granted for the water line.

**Packard Lands fill** - requesting preliminary and final site plan approval to place about 15,300 c.y. of fill material on the property. PCB SEQR neg dec recommendation and Preliminary and Final approvals were given. Tom Beck felt that erosion control measure may be present for fill taking place at the present time, but be under water. (Andy and Chris noted during a field trip that none were apparent.) Conditions of approval included placing of permanent markers at the proposed toe of the slopes on the shores of the pond, 5 feet tall, to mark placement of erosion control facilities; seed mix should be specified; a time line for completion of filling operations, to include a deadline of 12/31/15 after which applicant must return to the PBd for further filling; future filling increase will include a concept plan for future development.

**Planning Board Meeting – 8-7-13 – Jerry Leone and Bob Salmon to attend.**

**Rite Aid Pharmacy-Hitching Post Plaza – 549 Pittsford Victor Road** façade modifications requesting preliminary and final site plan approval. The CB has no environmental concerns and a SEQR is not required.

**Fairport Baptist Home – 4646 Nine Mile Point Road – entrance modification/canopy addition** requesting preliminary and final site plan approval. After discussing the application, the CB recommends a neg dec SEQR determination with the following findings:  
Elimination of approximately four parking spots in front of the building will increase green space on site by about 800 sq.ft.

Stormwater from the new roof configuration will be directed by downspout to the storm sewer.

The canopy will provide weather protection for drop off and pick up of residents and all other personnel visiting or employed by the facility.

The creation of the two porches on each side of the main entrance will provide an excellent feature for the residents as well as protection from the elements.

**Felton Subdivision – 433 Garnsey Road** – requesting preliminary and final subdivision approval to subdivide one lot into two lots. The CB had no environmental concerns and will recommend a neg.dec with the following findings:

The proposed subdivided lot will have a significant upward slope from Garnsey Road which is consistent with the neighboring properties on both sides.

In the event that a future house pad will be located, it appears that there will be appropriate options on the site.

Although the neighboring properties on each side currently have septic systems, sanitary and storm sewers run across the front of the property on Garnsey Road.

**Planning Board Meeting – 8-21-13** – Bob Salmon and Barb Wagner to attend.

**Alliger Subdivision** – 200 Thayer Road – requesting preliminary and final subdivision approval to subdivide an existing 10.618 acre parcel into two parcels. In reviewing the application, there appears to be a newly obtained ten-year conservation easement of 10.03 acres on the property. The CB will inquire as to what the intentions of the homeowner are going to be.

**Creekstone Development** - See prior discussion.

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joan M. Cannon, Secretary