

**Minutes of the Town of Perinton  
Planning Board Meeting of June 4, 2014**

**Planning Board Members Present**

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

**Conservation Board Members Present**

Andrew Rodman  
Jerry Leone

**Town Officials Present**

Robert Place, Town Attorney  
Thomas Beck, Commissioner, DPW  
Robert Kozarits, Town Engineer  
Lori Stid, Planning Board Clerk

**Absent**

Michael Doser, Director Code Enforcement & Development (CED)

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

**Sign(s): Higgins, Henderson, LLC – 6819 Pittsford-Palmyra Road**

Kevin Henderson and Tom Higgins present the application to the Board. Mr. Henderson states that they were before the Planning Board and Zoning Board in August of 2013 and received approvals. They bought the building about two years ago. One of the tenants was one of the owners and he signed a five year lease with a five year renewal. He was an oral surgeon, and had no need for any type of signage on the building. He developed a health problem in October and was forced to give up his practice due to poor health. They have been trying to lease the front part of the building, which is over 2000 square feet since October 2013, and as potential tenants come in, they want a sign on the building. He has told them they can't have a sign on the building as it is against Perinton Sign Code. He has told them that they are allowed to have their name on the directory, but he has lost potential tenants because of this issue. They have a pending tenant currently, subject to them being able to get a sign on the building. He is going to the ZBA on 6/23/14 asking for a variance of the Town of Perinton Sign Code Section 174-9B, to allow a second tenant sign 10"x108" on the bottom of the previously approved building mounted sign instead of a freestanding sign. He states that they have received a lot of compliments on the existing signage that was done by Craig Tesler and compliments what Perinton Dental has done. They have asked him to design a new sign that will adhere to all of the Town size requirements and make it look like one sign.

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

Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Beck if CED has any comments on this application. Mr. Beck states no.

Mr. Anderson states that he went back and reviewed the meeting minutes and he supported the sign and the variance. There was an extended discussion about this very issue and it was clear that the Board did not support any additional signage for additional tenants. On 8/21/13, the Planning Board granted sign approval for sign application received by the Town on 7/22/13, as submitted, subject to the following conditions:

1. Sign is to be mounted on the front (north side) of the building facing Route 31.
2. There is to be only one directory sign on the building; applicant may choose location to be either the east side of the building at the front door or south side of the building facing parking lot.
3. Applicant to obtain variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Perinton Sign Code Section 174-9 B, to allow one building mounted sign (40" x 108" – 30 sq.ft.) instead of a freestanding sign.
4. There is to be no other building mounted signage for any business located on the building.

On 8/26/13, the Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance of the Town of Perinton Sign Code Section 174-9 B, to allow one building mounted sign (40" x 108" – 30 sq.ft.) instead of a freestanding sign, subject to the following conditions:

1. Sign is to be mounted on the front (north side) of the building facing Route 31.
2. There is to be only one directory sign on the building; applicant may choose location to be either the east side of the building at the front door or south side of the building facing parking lot.
3. There is to be no other building mounted signage for any business located on the building.

Mr. Anderson states that in this location, with this type of zoning, there should just be a monument sign identifying the building, and all tenants on directory sign. He understands the issue, but the Board was clear. He feels that there are other options available. He does not support the request. He states that he feels that the existing sign is very attractive.

Mr. Lewis agrees with Mr. Anderson. Perhaps he should go to the Town Board and ask them to change the Code. There is no reason that this situation is unique and requires a variance. He does not support the request.

Mr. Brasley states that the existing sign is very attractive. He supports the request. The additional tenant that they are proposing is not going to be much different than what is there today. It is a small change and he doesn't feel that there will be any impact. This property is unique as it has an interesting site access. There is a Pittsford-Palmyra Road address, but car access is from Chardonnay and is difficult to find the entrance for someone who doesn't know where they are going, and in this case, a tenant sign would help. Because of this unique site access that you don't see at most other properties, approving this would not set a precedent. He is in favor of the necessary variance to allow it.

Mr. O'Brien agrees with Mr. Anderson. The existing sign is very attractive and what they are proposing below it won't be noticed as it is so small. It will be relatively ineffective. He does not support an additional tenant on this sign.

Mr. Antonelli likes the sign, but no one will be able to see it, especially anyone coming down Route 31. He doesn't support an additional tenant on this sign.

Mr. Gardner states that it isn't the sign as much as it is the Board's decision last year. The Board was clear, and for that reason, he doesn't support this request.

Ms. Neu supports the request. This is not a major change. She feels that it is bad to have empty buildings/portions of buildings because they won't rent without a sign.

Mr. O'Brien made a motion to deny sign application submitted to the Town on 5/2/14.

The rationale is that the August 21, 2013 Planning Board minutes reflect that one of the conditions of approval was that there is to be no other building mounted signage for any business located on the building, and it doesn't meet the Code.

Mr. Lewis seconds the motion.

Motion carries 5 – 2, with Mr. Brasley and Ms. Neu opposed.

Mr. Anderson states that the Planning Board will submit written comments to the Zoning Board regarding this proposal.

Mr. Henderson inquired if the potential tenant could have a monument sign. Mr. Anderson states that if he wants to take the building mounted sign down and put up a monument sign, they could ask the Town for that, but it would still be for only one business.

**New Application(s):**

**Crest Manor Living & Rehabilitation Center Expansion.** Parrone Engineering, as agent for Barco Holdings, LLC, owner of property located at 6745 Pittsford Palmyra Road (tax account number 166.17-2-27.1), requesting preliminary and final site plan approval for construction of a 1,000 square foot facilities building addition, which includes associated dumpster pad, 12 space employee parking lot, and storm sewer infrastructure to the existing facility.

**Presenter:** Parrone Engineering, Robert Steehler  
**Zoned:** Restricted Business & Residential A

Mr. Steehler presented the plans to the Board as per letter of intent as shown below. With him is John Bartholomew, property owner and Al Pardi, Architect for the project.

April 28, 2014

Lori Stid  
Town of Perinton  
1350 Turk Hill Road  
Fairport, New York 14450

Re: Crest Manor Facilities Building Addition  
Preliminary & Final Site Plan Approval

Dear Lori,

On behalf of our client, John Bartholomew II, we are submitting materials for your review in granting Preliminary Site Plan Approval and Final Site Plan Approval for the above-referenced project. We are requesting that this proposal be placed on the Planning Board's June 4, 2014 agenda.

The Crest Manor Living and Rehabilitation Facility is located on a 7.08-acre parcel on the southwest corner of the intersection of Pittsford-Palmyra Road and Courtney Drive. Development involves construction of a new 1,000 SF Facilities Building Addition and associated dumpster pad, 12-space employee parking lot, and storm sewer infrastructure. The Facilities Building Addition will provide indoor storage of maintenance equipment. Previously submitted proposed improvements to the site are void and will not be constructed at this time.

We believe the proposed addition adheres to the objectives of the Town of Perinton's Master Plan and Zoning Regulations while providing a necessary service to Crest Manor. Included within this submission, to aid in your review, please find the following:

- Fifteen (15) copies of this Letter of Intent
- Fifteen (15) complete sets of plans
- Fifteen (15) copies of the Site Plan Application
- Fifteen (15) copies of the Short Form EAF
- Fifteen (15) copies of the Preliminary Site Plan Checklist
- Fifteen (15) copies of the Final Site Plan Checklist
- Fifteen (15) copies of the Deed
- Fifteen (15) copies of the Building Elevations
- Five (5) copies of the Engineer's Report
- \$250 Preliminary Site Plan Review Fee
- \$250 Final Site Plan Review Fee
- Monroe County Development Referral Form for signature by Town official

We look forward to presenting this project at the June 4, 2014 Planning Board hearing. If you have any questions, please contact myself or the Project Manager, Gary Smith, at our office.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Robert J. Steehler  
PARRONE ENGINEERING

CC: John Bartholomew II  
Al Pardi

He acknowledges receipt of DPW & Monroe County comments and they have no issue with addressing any of these comments. The parking proposed is for employees so that they don't have to park any longer at the "park & ride".

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

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from the Conservation Board. Mr. Leone states that they are prepared to provide a SEQR recommendation.

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

**DPW Comments:**

General

1. Perinton parking space standard is 9'x18'. The parking spaces shown are 20' long – applicant should shorten stall length to reduce pavement width, decrease runoff and minimize tree removals and clearing at top of cut.
2. Label existing drainage structure to remain that FI 1.0 and FI 2.0 tie into.
3. Eliminate silt fence at bottom of cut and add silt fence on east side of new building to limit of work. Provide inlet projection for existing catch basin to remain.
4. There is a large pothole on the access drive near the entrance from Rte 250. The developer should repair this when the proposed parking lot is paved.



**PARRONE**  
engineering  
**ROCKSOLID**

THE PIANO WORKS  
349 W. COMMERCIAL STREET  
SUITE 3200  
EAST ROCHESTER, NY 14445  
T 585.586.0200  
F 585.586.6752  
WWW.PARRONEENG.COM

## **CED Comments:**

1. Addition will match architecture of existing structure.
2. Parking lot needs to be double hair-pin striped as per Town Code, and detail needs to be provided on the plan.
3. Full-size elevations need to be submitted with final signature plans.

Mr. Beck has nothing further.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from Attorney Place. Mr. Place asks the applicant if they intent to repair the pavement located in their access easement to Moseley Road as there is a very large pot hole there. Mr. Bartholomew states that the Vet Hospital owns that, but he will get this repaired as they will be working on the parking lot anyway.

Ms. Neu inquires if the maintenance addition will match the existing building or the dumpster enclosure. Mr. Pardi states that there are budgetary issues. It will be made out of masonry and will be similar in color to the brick of the building. This addition is in the rear of the building and is a maintenance garage. It is not very visible.

Mr. Gardner inquires if they could shorten their parking spaces to 9 X 18 as that could save a little bit of money and would still meet Town Code. With the money they would save, perhaps they could add that money into the façade. He thinks the radius is a lot for a 12 car parking lot for employees.

Mr. Antonelli supports the request and would like to see some bushes or trees added to replace what they are removing. He would like to see the colors and materials are on the final plans. He inquires if there will be any lighting. Mr. Bartholomew states that he is not sure. Mr. Antonelli states that he would like to see that information shown on the final plans.

Mr. O'Brien supports the request and agrees with Mr. Antonelli about landscaping and lighting. There should be lighting in the employee parking lot.

Mr. Brasley supports this request. He inquires as to what happened with the much larger addition that was approved a year ago. Mr. Bartholomew states it is a budget issue and they are not going forward with those plans. They have decided to reduce the number of beds and modernize the building as it made more financial sense. Mr. Brasley asked if the other approved project is "dead". Mr. Bartholomew states that it is for now. Perhaps in 5 years or so they may revisit it. Mr. Brasley agrees that any trees that are removed should be replaced. He feels that the new parking lot will need site lighting for employee safety. The lighting needs to be downward shining and full cut-off. He would like to see this shown on the final plans and have Town staff review to determine if ok. He inquires if there are any rooftop mechanicals proposed. Mr. Pardi states no; they are using all of the existing. Mr. Brasley states that he would like to see on the final plans the building heights, materials and colors.

Mr. Lewis inquires what the need is for this structure. Mr. Bartholomew states that it is for storage. They have expanded the resident units and have lost some storage space to make more living space and dining areas for the residents. They wish to have some parking for employees as they have been parking at the "Park & Ride" for years and it is not convenient and it is dark. This structure doesn't create a need for more parking; they are already short of parking. Mr. Lewis inquired if they would paint the structure the same color as the main building, and Mr. Bartholomew states yes.

Mr. Anderson supports the project. He would like to see heights, colors, materials, and lighting shown on the final plans. Mr. Anderson says that he doesn't wish to see building mounted wall packs shooting light out. The Town doesn't want to see the source of the light. He feels that pole parking will work. Mr. Pardi states that they plan to treat the entry area and make it more residential than it is now. They will be adding awnings and painting. Mr. Anderson inquired if they are asking the Board to approve modifications to the exterior, or is that in the future. Any exterior modifications would require Town approval. Mr. Beck states that the applicant should discuss with Town staff what these proposed exterior modifications are, and perhaps it could be an administrative review.

Mr. Leone states that the Conservation Board has met with the applicant's representative, reviewed the initial drawings, drawing revisions and supporting documentation provided by the applicant. As a result of the following findings, the Conservation Board recommends a Negative Declaration of SEQR.

1. Existing stormwater controls and structures are currently in place and balanced for the management of the deminimis increases in stormwater resulting from this planned expansion.
2. A minimal amount of impervious surface disruption is being proposed; green space on the site is proposed to be 82% vs. the required 35%.
3. The facility continues to serve as a community resource and the expansion will provide a needed space for the continued operation of the facility.
4. The improvements include upgrade of the facility's waste disposal and recycling containers.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to grant a Negative Declaration of SEQR for the reasons as stated by the Conservation Board.

Mr. Antonelli seconds the motion.

Motion carries 7 – 0.

Mr. Anderson inquired if a sidewalk determination is required and Mr. Beck states not on a project of this size.

Mr. Brasley made a motion to grant preliminary site plan approval for construction of a 1,000 square foot facilities building addition, which includes associated dumpster pad, 12 space employee parking lot, and storm sewer infrastructure to the existing facility for plans received by the Town on 4/28/14, subject to the following conditions:

1. Satisfaction of any remaining concerns of the DPW.
2. Applicant shall work with the adjacent veterinary hospital to repair the large pot hole on the shared driveway out to Moseley Road.
3. Applicant shall consider dropping each parking lot space down to 18' deep, which meets Town Code, instead of 20' as shown.
4. Applicant must replace the three trees that are proposed to be removed with new trees.
5. Applicant to identify the building height, color and materials on the final plans submitted for signature.
6. Applicant shall consider painting all of the additions to match the main building.
7. Applicant shall provide parking lot lighting using full cut-off downward shining lights.
8. There shall be no rooftop mechanicals on any of the building additions.

Mr. Antonelli seconds the motion.

Motion carries 7 – 0

Mr. Brasley made a motion to grant final site plan approval for construction of a 1,000 square foot facilities building addition, which includes associated dumpster pad, 12 space employee parking lot, and storm sewer infrastructure to the existing facility for plans received by the Town on 4/28/14, subject to the following conditions:

1. Satisfaction of any remaining concerns of the DPW.
2. Applicant shall work with the adjacent veterinary hospital to repair the large pot hole on the shared driveway out to Moseley Road.
3. Applicant shall consider dropping each parking lot space down to 18' deep, which meets Town Code, instead of 20' as shown.
4. Applicant must replace the three trees that are proposed to be removed with new trees.
5. Applicant to identify the building height, color and materials on the final plans submitted for signature.
6. Applicant shall consider painting all of the additions to match the main building.
7. Applicant shall provide parking lot lighting using full cut-off downward shining lights.
8. There shall be no rooftop mechanicals on any of the building additions.

Mr. Antonelli seconds the motion.

Motion carries 7 – 0

**Polisseni single family home – Keck Road.** BME Associates, as agent for Gregory Polisseni, owner of property located on the west side of Victor Road, south of its intersection with Keck Road (tax account number 194.02-1-15.1), requesting preliminary and final site plan approval for construction of a single family home on existing 97.9 acre parcel in a Residential Sensitive District.

**Presenter:** BME Associates, J. Lincoln Swedrock  
**Zoned:** Residential Sensitive

Mr. Swedrock presents the application to the Board as per letter of intent as shown below.

# BME | ASSOCIATES

ENGINEERS • SURVEYORS • LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

May 2, 2014

Planning Board  
Town of Perinton  
1350 Turk Hill Road  
Fairport, NY 14450



**Re: Polisseni Property  
Keck Road, Town of Perinton**

**2398**

Dear Board Members:

On behalf of Greg Polisseni, property owner of the Keck Road property, we are pleased to submit a Preliminary / Final Site plan for the above-referenced project. We have enclosed the following application materials for your review:

- Fifteen (15) copies of the Preliminary / Final Site Plans
- Fifteen (15) Planning Board Application
- Fifteen (15) Short Form EAF
- Fifteen (15) copies of Property Deed
- Fifteen (15) Preliminary Review Checklist
- Fifteen (15) Final Review Checklist
- Five (5) copies of Engineer's Report
- MCDPD Referral Form
- Owner Authorization to Make Application
- Letter to the Town of Perinton from Greg Polisseni dated April 30, 2014
- Agricultural Data Statement
- \$250.00 Site Plan Application Fee for Preliminary Approval
- \$250.00 Site Plan Application Fee for Final Approval

The proposal is to construct a single family house on the existing 97.9 acre parcel. The property is zoned Residential Sensitive and is located on the west side of Victor Road, south of its intersection with Keck Road.

A driveway is proposed off of Victor Road to access the single family home. A permit will be required from the Monroe County DOT for the driveway. A septic system is also proposed for the proposed house as sanitary sewers are not available. We have coordinated the percolation and deep hole tests with Town Staff as well as the Monroe County Health Department. A water service will be extended from Victor Road as well as private utilities to serve the proposed house. The project represents less than 5 acres of

TO LET BRIDGE LANE EAST

disturbance, and is therefore exempt from the requirements of NYSDEC GP-0-10-001 for post-construction stormwater management controls. However, the project includes a proposed pond and bridge over the pond for the proposed driveway.

The site contains a steep slope LDD and a creek flows west to east on the northern side of the site. The slope and LDD limits were established per a field topographic survey, and will be reviewed with the Conservation Board. The proposed project has been designed to avoid the LDD areas.

We request that given the minor development proposed that the Planning Board consider a combined Preliminary / Final Site review and approval.

We are requesting to appear on your June 4, 2014 meeting agenda. Please contact our office if you require any additional information prior to your meeting.

Thank you for your consideration of this application.

Sincerely,  
**BME Associates**



J. Lincoln Swedrock, P.E.

/JLS

Encl.

cc: Greg Polisseni  
Eric Hynes

The driveway would access Victor Road, which is a County Road and will require a DOT permit for the entrance. They will maintain wooded area and are staying away from sloped and wetland areas that have been identified on the site. He explained the layout and where the proposed garage and future pool will go. The utilities are septic as there is no sanitary sewer available. They are proposing a water service in off of Victor Road, as well as private utilities to serve that. He showed the pond location which will be for stormwater management and an aesthetic feature. There is bridge proposed to be over it. They have walked the site with Town staff and the Conservation Board. He acknowledges receipt of comments from DPW and Monroe County and have no issues with those comments. They have provided written response to DPW comments dated 6/4/14, which are a part of the record. He acknowledges receipt of letter from neighbor to the south (865 Victor Road), and she was at the Conservation Board meeting and expressed concern about contamination to organic garden during the construction process and any erosion and runoff from the site once developed. Mr. Swedrock states than an inlet is proposed to make sure that they pick up any runoff that would head that way. They have worked with DPW on perc holes. They will add some pine trees to help to screen the portion of the proposed driveway that comes within 20' of adjacent property to the south. He requests the Planning Board to make a recommendation to the ZBA for the oversized accessory structure. Mr. Anderson states that he feels that the Board would support that, but they won't make written comment until such time as the applicant submits an application to the ZBA requesting it.

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

Kathleen Crandall (lives north of this parcel). She expresses concern that she will lose the creek that runs through her property and wants to make sure that she won't lose the creek. The applicant states that they are not touching the creek; they are only collecting runoff from their area to the pond area that will discharge to the creek. They are not taking water out of the creek. She inquires if they wish to further subdivide or add other structures will they be required to come back to the Town. Mr. Anderson states that if they wish to subdivide or add structures it would require Town approval. If they wish to clear trees, they could.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from the Conservation Board. Mr. Rodman states that they have met with the applicant's engineer and the neighbor at 865 Victor Road and the Board is prepared to make a SEQR recommendation.

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

**DPW Comments:**

General

1. Add a note to the grading plan and sequence of construction stating the clearing limits need to be identified in the field and approved by DPW prior to commencing clearing operations.
2. Provide water service sizing calculations. Show the location for the nearest hydrant on the utility plan.
3. The proposed driveway and bridge needs to accommodate an emergency fire apparatus. An adequate turn around area per NYS Fire Code criteria is required near the buildings – verify the proposed geometry can accommodate this.

4. According to the Engineering report, proposed stormwater runoff exceeds existing run off rates. Modify pond accordingly to ensure no increased runoff will occur as a result of this project.
5. Consider providing additional landscape or screening for the portion of proposed driveway that comes within 20' from the adjacent property to the south.

**CED Comments:**

1. Garage is approximately 7200 sq. ft., which requires a variance for being oversized, per §208-14R(1).
2. Pool house is approximately 560 sq. ft., which requires a variance for being an oversized accessory building, per §208-14G.
3. The proposed dwelling is more than 500 feet from the right-of-way. The Town Design Criteria requires either a hydrant within 500 feet of a structure(s) (§270-4) or a residential sprinkler system (§270-6B).

He thanks the applicant for the written response to these comments. He asks for clarification on the driveway. The fire truck turning radius information shows that the truck will have to do a 3 point turn to get back out. Mr. Swedrock states that he thinks they can make the loop depending on the size of the truck. Mr. Swedrock states that they can work with DPW to satisfy this concern. He asks for clarification on the CED comment about the hydrant or residential sprinkler. Mr. Swedrock states that they will install a private hydrant, and have to confirm that with water authority. They would prefer that over a residential sprinkler system.

Mr. Beck has nothing further.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from Attorney Place. Mr. Place states that a Park Fund contribution determination should be made.

Mr. Anderson supports the project. They have done a good job controlling the drainage. Mr. Anderson is pleased that they will add landscaping between the driveway and the closest parcel. He asks what the use is proposed to be for the proposed 7000 sf garage. Mr. Swedrock states that it is for vehicle storage. At their current home they have a similar type situation to store vehicles. Mr. Anderson inquires if they plan to run a business out of the garage and Mr. Swedrock states no; it is for storage. Mr. Anderson states that a 97 acre site can support a 7000 sf garage and he would support that.

Mr. Lewis inquires how many stories the proposed house is going to be, and the applicant states 2 stories. Mr. Lewis inquires if there will be a basement and the applicant states yes. Mr. Lewis inquires if the garage is two-story. Mr. Swedrock states that Eric Hynes and Todd Jones are present tonight and will be doing the construction. Mr. Hynes states that part of it will be 2 stories. Mr. Lewis inquires what will be on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the garage. Mr. Hynes states it will be an art gallery as the owner is an artist. Mr. Lewis inquired if there is a stairway to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and Mr. Hynes states yes. Mr. Lewis inquired if there would be a bathroom and Mr. Hynes states yes. Mr. Lewis inquired if the garage could be a living quarter and Mr. Hynes states no. Mr. Lewis asked why not. Mr. Hynes states that is no kitchen proposed. Mr. Lewis inquired if it is intended to be occupied and Mr. Hynes states no. Mr. Lewis states that years ago this parcel was proposed to be 12 houses and it was difficult with the LDD. Apparently the idea was abandoned as it never happened. Mr. Lewis inquired if further subdivision of this parcel is in the future. Mr. Hynes states not with this owner. Mr. Lewis asks if they would object to it being a condition of approval that there be no further subdivision. Mr. Swedrock states that he would need to discuss that with his client. Mr. Hynes states that can be a condition. Mr. Hynes inquires if there can be additional outbuildings. Mr. Lewis states yes; with approval. Mr. Lewis supports the proposal.

Mr. Brasley states that this is a large parcel and can support the proposed development. He doesn't see any impact to any neighbors.

Mr. O'Brien asks if you can see the house from the road in the winter. Mr. Hynes states that you will in the winter. Mr. O'Brien supports the project.

Mr. Antonelli supports the project. He inquires why they picked the access they did. Mr. Hynes states that there are steep slopes.

Mr. Gardner supports the project.

Ms. Neu supports the project.

Mr. Rodman states that the Perinton Conservation Board has reviewed the plans submitted for the proposed Polisseni single family home on Keck Road. After reviewing the plans, speaking with the applicant's engineers and a neighbor, the Board recommends a Negative Declaration be issued under SEQR for this project. Findings are:

1. The proposed single family house, pool and garage on approximately 100 acres will not result in a significant impact to the environment.
2. The use of the proposed pond for stormwater collection and detention is designed to handle the stormwater from the site.
3. The soil on the southwest corner of the property is suited for the intended use of this area with no increase in runoff offsite.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to grant a Negative Declaration of SEQR for the reasons as cited by the Conservation Board.

Mr. Lewis seconds the motion.

Motion carries 7 – 0.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to require the applicant to make a contribution to the Town Park fund to support the Town's recreation and park development goals.

Mr. Lewis seconds the motion.

Motion carries 7 – 0.

Mr. Lewis made a motion to grant preliminary site plan approval for construction of a single family home on existing 97.9 acre parcel in a Residential Sensitive District for plans received by the Town on 5/2/14, subject to the following conditions:

1. Satisfaction of any remaining concerns of the DPW.
2. There is to be no further subdivision of this parcel of land.
3. Applicant to provide additional landscape or screening for the portion of proposed driveway that comes within 20' from the adjacent property to the south.
4. Applicant to obtain any necessary variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. O'Brien seconds the motion.

Motion carries 7 – 0.

Mr. Lewis made a motion to grant final site plan approval for construction of a single family home on existing 97.9 acre parcel in a Residential Sensitive District for plans received by the Town on 5/2/14, subject to the following conditions:

1. Satisfaction of any remaining concerns of the DPW.
2. There is to be no further subdivision of this parcel of land.
3. Applicant to provide additional landscape or screening for the portion of proposed driveway that comes within 20' from the adjacent property to the south.
4. Applicant to obtain any necessary variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. O'Brien seconds the motion.

Motion carries 7 – 0.

Mr. Anderson states that when the applicant does submit to the ZBA for the oversized garage (as shown on plans), the Board will make a positive recommendation to the ZBA.

**Perinton Hills Apartments – 600 – 900 Perinton Hills Office Park.** Costich Engineering, PC, as agent for Uniland Development Company, as agent for Interwest Holdings I, LLC, owner of property located at 687 Moseley Road - buildings 600 through 900 Perinton Hills Office Park Road (tax id #180.05-1-33.11) requesting preliminary site plan approval for construction of a residential development project that will provide 60 apartment units in six buildings.

**Presenter:** Costich Engineering, Michael Montalto  
**Zoned:** Apartments

Mr. Montalto presents the application to the Board as per letter of intent as shown below.



**COSTICH  
ENGINEERING, P.C.**

Project No. U170

May 02, 2014

Ms. Lori Stid  
Planning Board Secretary  
Town of Perinton  
1350 Turk Hill Road  
Fairport, New York 14450

Re: Perinton Hills Apartments  
600-900 Perinton Hills Office Park  
Site Plan Application



Dear Lori:

On behalf of our client Uniland Development Company, we are submitting revised materials to the Planning Board for Preliminary Site Plan approval for the above reference project. We are requesting the project be added to the Planning Board's June 4<sup>th</sup>, 2014 agenda for preliminary Site Plan approval.

The project is located at the south west corner of the intersection of Pittsford-Palmyra Road and Moseley Road. The project is an upscale residential apartment development project that will provide 60 apartment units in six buildings. The project entails the redevelopment of approximately 6.4 acres of the Perinton Hills office complex. Four of the existing seven office buildings have been raised to facilitate the construction of the apartment buildings. The apartment buildings are to be developed at the southern portion of the site. The apartment buildings offer a mix of one, two, and three bedroom units. The apartments feature individual garages with separate entrances and laundry facilities for each unit.

The Town Board granted approval for the rezoning, of the lands to be redeveloped, to Apartment zoning at its March 26, 2014 hearing. The redevelopment plan complies with the zoning requirements for the Apartment zoning district. Redevelopment of the property decreases the amount of impervious surface area from the office building uses and provides improved transitional buffering to the surrounding residential. In addition to providing stormwater management enhancements to the area being redeveloped, for the apartments, the existing stormwater management facility for the Perinton Hills Plaza, located adjacent to Pittsford-Palmyra Road, is to be upgraded during this project.

No new access points to the area roadways are to be constructed with this project. The "main" entrance to the apartment complex has been developed to connect to the existing access point on Moseley Road. Pedestrian links have been created connecting the apartment development to the adjoining retail plaza.

To aid in your review attached please find the following:

- Fifteen (15) Copies of this Letter of Intent
- Fifteen (15) Copies of the Site Development Drawings
- Fifteen (15) Copies of the Building Elevation
- Fifteen (15) Copies of the Deed for the Property
- Fifteen (15) Copies of the Site Plan Application
- Fifteen (15) Copies of the Short Environmental Assessment Form
- Five (5) Copies of the Engineer's Report
- One (1) Copy of the Authorization to Make Application Form
- One (1) Site Plan Application Fee Check in the amount of \$250.00

We look forward to appearing before the Board at it's June 4<sup>th</sup> hearing. In the meantime if you should have any comments, questions or require additional information please contact our office.

With him is Kevin Kirk from Uniland. This parcel was rezoned by the Town Board on 3/26/14. The parcel is approximately 6.4 acres of a 12 acre site. There is approximately a 28% reduction in impervious surface associated with the redevelopment. There are approximately 3.2 acres of green space on the 6.4 portion. They will revise calculations for final to show the overall green space as it relates to the full 12 acres. They are providing 181 parking spaces where the code requires 180. The buildings are two-story residential buildings.

The provided a conceptual elevation of the front of the building. The architectural team is working on the building elevations, and he shows the advanced elevations (posted on wall). Each building has its' own garage and the end units also have a garage. There are 10 parking spaces within the building. There is an individual parking space for each apartment. There is individual laundry. There are individual entrances. He acknowledges receipt of DPW comments. They are looking at revising the sanitary sewer system to make it more shallow. They are changing some of the routing for stormwater to take advantage of the existing stormwater management facility out at Route 31. Relative to a pedestrian link to the area; the plans that they submitted show an internal sidewalk system allowing the apartment buildings to be connected to the plaza. They have met with Town staff and will be changing the plans for submission for final that show a main pedestrian link from the apartment complex out to the sidewalk system on Moseley Road. This allows them to construct sidewalks in lands that they have control of. As far as Perinton Hills, although they have been agreeable to sidewalks being put through there, it has been with the caveat that nothing can change within their system and they don't lose any parking spaces doing that. This is problematic. There isn't really a god way to introduce a sidewalk system that would afford the kind of safety that is necessary to keep pedestrians and vehicles separate. They will try to work with Perinton Hills to make some connectivity to connect to Route 31. They will reduce the lighting levels from what was originally submitted and have it be more accent lighting. They will still utilize the 14' high full cut off shoe box style, but reducing the amount of fixtures to lower the overall illumination values. They will add some lighting to the apartment façade. They realize that there are issues with the DPW. This submission was only for preliminary as they knew there would be some potential issues. They have met with DPW and don't believe that there are any planning issues.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from the audience. Manuel Lopes, 67 Blackwatch Trail, inquired about the existing footpath and if it could be connected to a sidewalk. Mr. Montalto states that they were looking at adding vegetation to that area to provide privacy. Mr. Lopes expressed concern about the footpath being closed off as it provides access to Starbucks, etc. He also inquired if they will clean out the creek. Mr. Kirk states it is not their land.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from the Conservation Board. Mr. Leone states that they have provided the Town Board with a SEQR recommendation based on the rezoning and are prepared to provide a SEQR recommendation this evening.

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

#### **DPW Comments:**

##### General

1. This project proposes to construct 60 residential units adjacent to commercial development with the understanding that residents will have pedestrian access to local businesses. As such, the applicant needs to develop a plan to install sidewalks that provide pedestrian access from this project to the sidewalks along Route 31 and Route 250. For example, the access drive near Building 1100 can be connected to Rte 250 with a sidewalk that runs behind existing building 500.
2. Hatched pavement markings through the existing parking lot for RAC will not be adequate. Sidewalk should be extended behind building 700 adjacent to existing curb and tie into parking lot at the existing stop sign.
3. The applicant's engineer needs to submit a Letter of Credit estimate for all the proposed site work to be reviewed by the D.P.W.
4. The applicant's engineer needs to provide descriptions for all easements that are proposed to be abandoned and for new easements proposed for this project. The Town will only accept an easement over the new sanitary sewer. The new storm sewer will remain privately owned.
5. There are a number of references to "See Easement Note No. 3" which does not appear to be a part of these plans.
6. Label all access drive widths on the site plan.
7. What will the name of the apartments be, and how will they be identified by emergency responders?
8. Add signature blocks to plans.
9. Eliminate the proposed parking along the access drive behind Building 600.
10. On drawing CA 500, eliminate the wire mesh from the concrete sidewalk detail and instead increase the thickness to 5" and specify fibermesh shall be added to the mix.
11. Revise special note on sidewalk detail that prohibits draining parking lots over walkways, since the project requires this type of drainage in order for flow to be directed to bioswales.

##### Utilities

1. The proposed extension to the sanitary sewer is currently shown to be 18 feet deep. As discussed with the applicant's engineer, the sewer will be redesigned to a shallower depth. Provide profile for both the proposed additions to the sanitary and storm sewers.
2. Elevation difference between pipes for proposed drop manholes shall be greater than 30".
3. Specify that the existing sanitary sewer along the east side of the proposed building 700 is to be removed to just outside the existing manhole and the end of the pipe is to be plugged.
4. The top grate elevations shown for several proposed inlets are higher than the proposed grade around it. For example, DA-1 shows a top of grate elevation of 575.8 while the surrounding proposed grade is 572.
5. Drainage for buildings 600, 700, 900, 1000 and 1100 should be connected to the existing system that discharges to the stormwater management pond by Route 31.
6. Revise the Sanitary and Storm Sewer notes on sheet GA 110 to state that Sanitary Sewer mains shall be PVC SDR-35, and storm sewer laterals shall be PVC SDR-35. Storm sewer main can be either PVC SDR-35 or HDPE as noted. Add a note that connections to the storm sewer are to be accomplished with inserta-tee connections.
7. Storm drainage captured in structures DA-1 and DA-2 as well as rooftop run off from buildings 1000 and 1100 should be directed to the bioretention area prior to going to existing structure DA.
8. Add note to the utility plans that all sanitary laterals outside of the easement are private.
9. Clarify watermain note #3 on CA 110 and whether mains are to remain private or not.
10. Shift sanitary sewer manhole S-3 to the east and tie lateral for building 1100 into pipe with a wye instead of connecting to manhole.

11. Provide a catch basin detail for proposed drainage structures on this project.

#### Grading/Erosion Control

1. Show the location for the proposed Stabilized Construction Entrance.
2. The design calculations for the retaining wall north of Buildings 600 and 700 shall include vehicle loading surcharge and the wall section included in the plans should reflect any geogrid material or other means of increased overturning resistance needed behind the wall as a result. The wall detail in this area should also include provisions for preventing vehicles from driving off the wall since it appears to be at least 4' tall.
3. Confirm approximately 4000 cy of fill needs to be imported to the site in order to construct the development.
4. Increase size of bioswale north of Building 1100 to accommodate additional pavement and roof runoff.
5. Deepen Route 31 detention pond by at least 1' and consider providing outlet control structure over existing 12" cmp outlet to make better use of increased pond volume. Maximum water elevation in pond should be kept below elevation 545.0 to avoid impacting water quality unit installed for Walgreens project.

#### Landscape

1. Correct discrepancies between plant schedule and proposed plantings plan.
2. Revise layout for shrubs north of building 600 to be out of the pavement.

#### SWPPP

1. In order to justify Curve Number values as proposed in the SWPPP, soil restoration/decompaction (at least 24" depth prior to placing topsoil needed for all lawn areas and new vegetated swales).

#### **CED Comments:**

1. Applicant applied for and received approval to rezone 6.4-acre portion of property from Commercial zoning to Apartment zoning from the Town Board on March 26, 2014.
2. The Town of Perinton Comprehensive Plan identifies this area of the Perinton Hills complex to be appropriate for multi-family residential development. The development borders an area to the north identified as appropriate for mixed-use development. Together, the combination will create a dynamic area of commercial and residential uses, thereby fulfilling one of the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.
3. Handicapped signs need to say "permit required".
4. Applicant should provide lot occupancy calculations. The Town Code, per §208-35K, states lot occupancy shall not exceed 30 percent of the development project area (apartment buildings and all appurtenant structures).

Mr. Beck thanks the applicant and the engineer for meeting with them. In general, the DPW feels this is a good project.

Mr. Anderson asked for questions or comments from Attorney Place. Mr. Place states that the minimum distance between buildings is 20' or the height of the tallest building, whichever is greatest. If the applicant does not meet the building separation requirement they will need to require an area variance. Mr. Montalto states that the building separation complies. The number of units (without the full 12 acres; just looking at 6.4 acres) it complies with density. They do need to work with Town staff as there is office and apartment on one parcel, and how final plans get represented from a zoning data standpoint. Mr. Place asks what the height is of the tallest apartment building. Mr. Montalto states that right now they are working at keeping them 40'. There is 43' separation between the buildings. They don't want to get into variances for height. Mr. Place states that a park fund contribution determination is required.

Mr. Beck inquires if they plan to subdivide off this portion from the remaining acreage. Mr. Montalto states no. If this use is successful, the other office buildings may ultimately become apartments in the future.

Ms. Neu states that the elevations that were submitted in the package are not what has been shown tonight. She likes the architectural renderings better from what was submitted to the Town than what is being shown tonight. Mr. Montalto states that the architectural design will change. What was submitted to the Town was preliminary in nature. Ms. Neu states that what they are showing tonight looks more industrial. The architect is working with the property owner and they will submit all four elevations as part of final submission with all of the detail on them. They will pass onto the architect that the Town would like to see additional detail. MS. Neu inquired if they would remove the industrial lighting fixtures and have it be a more residential style. Mr. Kirk states that they can do that.

Mr. Gardner inquires as to the function of the single garage. They spent a lot of effort and a lot of pavement to get to that. Mr. Montalto states that it is based on the floor plans of the units. Mr. Gardner expressed concern about the 4' retaining wall and vehicular safety. Mr. Montalto states that there will likely be a timber guide rail and the wall will have to extend out further. The final plans will show a design of that wall. They are showing about 4000 yards of fill. If they lower the site by about 5", it makes it balance, and will help with the wall. They are working with the architect to discuss foundations to take it account with the earthwork. Mr. Gardner feels that it is in the best interest of Perinton Hills Mall and this applicant to maximize the pedestrian access to make this a success for these apartments as residents will likely utilize the stores within the plaza. Mr. Gardner feels that this is a good re-use of this property.

Mr. Antonelli supports the project. He would like to see the lighting be more residential in style. He would like to see the site balance and be less intrusive to the surrounding area. He inquires what the square north of the sidewalk is. Mr. Montalto states that is a proposed playground area. Mr. Antonelli inquires if it will be concrete. MR. Montalto states they are not sure yet. MR. Antonelli would like to see the pedestrian access detail.

Mr. O'Brien supports the project and is ready to move forward.

Mr. Brasley supports the project. He likes that there are no variances required. He encourages the applicant to stay consistent to that when they submit for final. He would like to see the building elevations be more attractive. There are some very inexpensive ways to make the buildings more attractive with better window trim, box bay windows, breaking up the roof ridge line; change of

materials in certain areas and different colors will help. He would like to see the lighting more residential in character and see details on that. He would like to see the parking lot pole lights match building/porch/garage door lights; just like they would on a normal house. Pedestrian access is key. Getting pedestrians in and out of this project is vital. He would like to see detail on playground and retaining wall. He is not prepared to go to preliminary as there are a lot of questions and outstanding issues. He does like the idea of the proposal, but is lacking too much detail.

Mr. Lewis states that if he understands correctly; they are proposing to bring the pedestrian access out to 250 and not 31 because Perinton Hills is a hurdle. Mr. Montalto states that they are trying to keep pedestrian and vehicular traffic separate. Routing all of the pedestrians through Perinton Hills parking lot is not an optimum solution. Mr. Lewis inquired if the project is age targeted. Mr. Montalto states it is an upper level apartment experience with no age restrictions. Mr. Lewis doesn't think that most people will walk to Wegmans and buy a week of groceries. People drive. Mr. Montalto states that there are restaurants and other stores in the plaza that could see some foot traffic. Mr. Lewis feels that it is ok just to get people out to Route 250 from the site and not necessarily Route 31. Mr. Montalto states it will be challenging and a loss of pavement. Mr. Lewis is prepared to go to preliminary tonight.

Mr. Anderson supports the project, but it seems like there is a lot of questions and a lot of detail to work out. He is not sure what they are proposing the buildings to look like. The elevations on the wall are not what was submitted to the Town. Mr. Kirk states that they are still working on that with the architect. Mr. Anderson inquired if they will all be the same look, and Mr. Kirk states yes. Mr. Anderson inquired what the height of the buildings is proposed to be. Mr. Kirk states that it will be slightly under the 40' restriction. Mr. Anderson feels that the architectural elevations that were shown to the Board tonight are bland; especially for presenting to a main access road. Mr. Montalto states that they purposely only asked for preliminary so that they could hear the comments and submit final plans after incorporating the changes that were discussed at preliminary. Mr. Anderson inquired they still plan to have no variances, and Mr. Montalto states they don't plan to seek any variances. Mr. Anderson asked what their thoughts are on the sidewalk. Mr. Montalto states that they have control of the portion of the site that they own. They can get a sidewalk out to Moseley, but not necessarily to Route 31. They will work with the adjacent landowner and DPW to try to get what the Town is seeking as far as pedestrian access.

There was a discussion amongst the Board members as to if this project should go to preliminary or not tonight and a majority of the Board was in favor of preliminary.

Mr. Leone states that the Conservation Board has met with the applicant's representative, reviewed the initial drawings, drawing revisions and supporting documentation provided by the applicant. As a result of the following findings, the Board recommends a Negative Declaration of SEQR:

1. The new buildings and infrastructure will result in a net reduction in impervious surface;
2. Stormwater management for the entire Perinton Hills plaza will be improved and updated;
3. The project will provide walkable access to nearby commercial facilities;
4. As a redevelopment of a demolition site, the proposed buildings will aesthetically blend in well with the existing and neighboring apartment buildings;
5. Landscaping will be improved and updated.
6. The project is consistent with the most recent Town Master Plan.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to grant a Negative Declaration of SEQR, for reasons as cited by the Conservation Board.

Mr. Gardner seconds the motion.

Motion carries 7 – 0.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to require the applicant to make a contribution to the Town Park fund to support the Town's recreation and park development goals.

Mr. Lewis seconds the motion.

Motion carries 7 – 0.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to grant preliminary site plan approval for construction of a residential development project that will provide 60 apartment units in six buildings for plans received by the Town on 5/2/14, subject to the following conditions:

1. Satisfaction of any remaining concerns of the DPW.
2. A pedestrian access plan be developed to enable access to and from the site to the adjoining properties to the satisfaction of the DPW & submitted to the Town as part of final site plan approval request.
3. Applicant to provide elevations for all 4 sides, including building heights, colors & materials.
4. Applicant to incorporate feedback received from the Planning Board tonight in regard to the elevations, in particular, the rear elevations to be more aesthetically pleasing.
5. Applicant to submit detail for lighting fixtures, which are to be a more residential look and feel.
6. Applicant to provide detail for the retaining walls.
7. Applicant to provide detail for any safety features for vehicular traffic.
8. Applicant to provide enhanced corner details, gable details with a variety of materials, especially the rear of the building on the main access drive and the fronts of all of the other buildings.
9. Applicant to provide detail on the playground/recreation area.

Mr. Lewis seconds the motion.

Motion carries 6 – 1, with Mr. Brasley opposed.

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 9:15 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lori L. Stid, Clerk