

WEBSTER TOWN PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

PLACE: Webster Town Board Meeting Room 1002 Ridge Road

TIME: 7:00 p.m.

DATE: 16 February 2021

PRESENT:

Anthony Casciani, Chairman

Dave Malta, Vice Chairman

Dave Arena, Secretary

Derek Anderson

Derek Meixell

Mark Giardina

John Kosel

Raja Sekharan, Attorney

Josh Artuso, Director of Community Development

Katherine Kolich, Recording Secretary

ABSENT:

APPEARANCE BEFORE THE BOARD

SCHEDULED ITEMS:

COUNTRY MAX-SIGN

Applicant: Don Payne

Drawing: N/A

Dated: N/A

Revision: N/A

Status: **APPROVED W/CONDITIONS: ELIMINATE SECOND LINE OF VERBAGE IN SIGN; BACK LIT ON BOTH SIDES; ADDRESS ON SIGN**

VILLAGE VET

Applicant: Andrea Blitz

Dated: N/A

Revision: N/A

Status: **APPROVED PRELIMINARY & FINAL. SIGN TO CONFORM TO CODE AND JUST LETTERS TO BE LIT, OPAQUE BACK.**

JIFFY LUBE

Applicant: Bohler Engineering

Dated: N/A

Revision: N/A

Status: **SKETCH REVIEW**

ROCHESTER LINOLEUM PLAZA-PARKING

Applicant: Dave Spoleto

Dated: N/A

Revision: N/A

Status: **SITE PLAN REVIEW. SITE PLAN NEEDS ENGINEER DRAWING.**

Mr. Casciani welcomed everyone to tonight's meeting of the Planning Board of February 16, 2021. There are four items on the agenda, and we can get started.

Pledge of Allegiance; Roll Called

Mr. Casciani: Ok, the first one is Country Max and yes there are four of them. Do you want to go ahead Dave?

Dave Arena read the first application:

COUNTRY MAX SIGNAGE: Located at 695 Ridge Road. Applicant Don Payne is requesting **SIGN APPROVAL** for (1) 72 sf building mounted sign and (1) 102 sf monument sign associated with the Country Max store on a 6.72-acre parcel having SBL # 079.17-1-78.121 located in an MC Medium Intensity Commercial District under Section 178-7 of the Code of the Town of Webster.

Appearing before the board was Don Payne with Country Max Stores. Would you like me to put these up? They are the same copies that you have.

Mr. Casciani: Well. Are you guys ok with what you have in front of you? Ok, don't bother

Don Payne: So, it is show on the site plan both the monument and the building sign. The building sign is just on the front. The plan that you have shows it on the side and the front, but I was mistaken and didn't realize that the side sign is not going to be included.

Mr. Casciani: Ok, so you are not going to bother with that one?

Don Payne: No

Mr. Casciani: I will tell you want though; the building is looking good.

Don Payne: Why thank you. I hope we can get the telephone poll out of the driveway.

Mr. Casciani: We heard a lot more jokes about that.

Don Payne: It is a safety hazard and I wish somebody would help us. We can't get them to move it.

Mr. Casciani: Your serious?

Don Payne: I'm serious and we have been since October trying to get that thing moved. The DOT finally said to pave it because we had our permit open and we wanted to get it paved prior to the close of the plans this fall so we paved around it and we have been battling since. We finally got them to move the electric off, but it still has the other services on it. So, DOT would like us to move the crates out of the way and they want a barrier there. If we remove those crates someone is going to run into that poll. It is a driveway. So, will keep trying it's frustrating.

Mark Giardina: I have a question Mr. Chairman about the monument sign.

Mr. Casciani: Go ahead. I was waiting for the question as I was going through the stuff.

Mark Giardina: I like the coloring but to be honest with you, I find it to be very cluttered in a sense and I am referring to the one here. (holds up picture of proposed sign) Do you really need all the verbiage that you have on there? Couldn't it be like Country Max as you have on your sheet here, Webster or Country Max and whatever the address is going to be? Is it Hatch Road or Ridge Road?

Don Payne: It is Ridge Road. The Town told us that the address would officially be Ridge Road.

Mark Giardina: Ok

Don Payne: We started on Hatch Road.

Mark Giardina: As I said, I like the coloring, but I just think that this to much verbiage and it's too cluttered. You know, stores for your real life, pets, wild bird, equine, lawn and garden, feed. I don't know what the rest of the board members think about that.

Mr. Casciani: Well, Country Max Stores, pets, wild bird, equine, lawn, and garden. Do you need that in the center? I think... do you need that part?

Don Payne: Quite often people ask us who we are or what it is so that is why we have the descriptive below it.

Mr. Casciani: No, I think that is good, but do you need "for your real life: in there? I think that might be more. Is that necessary? And what would be good too, is you should put the address in somewhere in there. The physical address of the site.

Mark Giardina: I highly recommend that because that is what we have been doing anyway. The time that I have been here which is a good idea. Because here again, I was somewhat confused one application says Ridge Road and the other says Hatch Road.

Don Payne: That was from the Town. We started with 1065 Hatch Road and we were told to change it to 695 Ridge Road by the town so that is what we did.

Mark Giardina: Well that is just my opinion. I think that it would be a nice sign if we eliminated some of the wording.

Mr. Casciani: If you set this and I am trying to think of the layout of the land. It does drop down so if you are 25 feet off the right of way, which is where you must be with the sign, is that dropping down the hill some at that point?

Don Payne: It drops down 2 feet, but the allowance is 6 foot high so that's ...

Mr. Casciani: Ok, you are ok with that?

Don Payne: Well, I think we must be ok

Mr. Casciani: Well 6 foot unless you can flatten the grade a little bit where the sign goes just to get it up a little higher. You want it to work where you can see it. You don't want to be looking down the hill at it. Does anybody else have any issues? Mark has a point there. If you can just, if it's possible, just to eliminate that center piece?

Don Payne: Yes

Mr. Casciani: Just put the address. What is it, 625 you said?

Don Payne: 695

Mr. Casciani: 695 somewhere on there. Lighting, are you going to put lights on it?

Don Payne: Behind so it is back lit.

Mr. Casciani: Showing on both sides, right?

Don Payne: Yes.

Mr. Casciani: So, it will be lit up on to it?

Don Payne: It will be lit inside it.

Mr. Casciani: Oh, I'm sorry. Ok. Ok, that's good. Just the figures are lit, and the blue is dark.

Don Payne: Yes, right.

Mr. Casciani: Does anybody have any concerns?

Mark Giardina: Just the verbiage

Mr. Casciani: Ok so we have this monument sign and then the one on the building. It is substantial below what the allowed use allowed signs would be. Isn't it Josh? It's about half of what it could be.

Josh Artuso: Yes, it is.

Mr. Casciani: Less than half. Alright, does someone want to do a SEQR on it?

Derek Anderson:

RESOLUTION

Town of Webster Planning Board considered the request by Applicant, Don Payne for a 72 square foot building mounted sign and a 102 square foot monument sign for Country Max located at 695 Ridge Road on a 6.72-acre lot having SBL #079.17-1-78.121.

The Planning Board classifies the proposed action to be a Type II Action under Section 617.5(c)(9) of the State Environmental Review (SEQR) Regulations and therefore is not subject to further review.

RESOLUTION 21-010

Mr. Anderson made a motion for **TYPE II SEQR** which was seconded by Mr. Arena.

VOTE:

Mr. Anderson	AYE
Mr. Arena	AYE
Mr. Kosel	AYE
Mr. Malta	AYE
Mr. Meixell	AYE
Mr. Casciani	AYE
Mr. Giardina	AYE

RESOLUTION 21-011

Mr. Giardina made a motion to **APPROVE COUNTRY MAX SIGNAGE**: Located at 695 Ridge Road. Applicant Don Payne for (1) 72 sf building mounted sign and (1) 102 sf monument sign associated with the Country Max store on a 6.72-acre parcel having SBL # 079.17-1-78.121 located in an MC Medium Intensity Commercial District under Section 178-7 of the Code of the Town of Webster of the Town of Webster which was seconded by Mr. Kosel.

VOTE:

Mr. Anderson	AYE
Mr. Arena	AYE
Mr. Kosel	AYE
Mr. Malta	AYE
Mr. Meixell	AYE
Mr. Casciani	AYE
Mr. Giardina	AYE

Conditions:

- The monument sign: the wording for *your real life* be eliminated and instead to include the address of the establishment which is 695 Ridge Road.
- Building sign is approved as presented

Mr. Casciani: When do you propose opening, the spring?

Don Payne: In April.

Mr. Casciani: Looks great and there is a lot of compliments on it. I think what you've done is a great job.

Dave Arena read the second application:

VILLAGE VET: Located at 40 Commons Boulevard. Applicant Andrea Blitz is requesting **PRELIMINARY / FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL (PUBLIC HEARING)** associated with the proposed construction of a 6,000 SF veterinary office on a 1.44-acre parcel having SBL # 079.16-1-24.232 located in an MC Medium Intensity Commercial District under Section 228-8 of the Code of the Town of Webster.

Appearing before the board was David Cox with Passero Associates. The Civil Engineer for the project and with me is Andrea Blitz who is the owner of the Village Vet. We are here for Preliminary and Final site plan approval tonight. We came before the board earlier for a concept approval and we have also gone to the ZBA and received our variances that we needed so, we are ready to go here and just to give kind of a brief review and I will keep it short and sweet.

The Village Vet has been extremely successful, and the business has grown in the current pandemic because more people at home and more people are getting pets so she has experienced a lot of growth and her current facility there is just no room for growth and short on parking. She needs a new place, so she has been looking for awhile and she finally found 40 Commons Boulevard. It's a perfect fit and the right size for the property and the last piece to the puzzle to this whole development. So, it's nice to get that last puzzle piece in and completely finished. The parking is for any of the customers is in the front here (showing on the plans) and then there is parking in the back for staff and the stormwater management for the entire complex is on the property and that is what kind of forced the building up near the front of the road which required the setback variance.

Since we were here last there was some town and agency comments and we have addressed all those. One of them being from the sanitary sewer department. There is a sanitary sewer manhole right there (showing on the plans) and there was a parking lot right over top of that and they said if we want to access that and there is a car parked over it, that is not good. So, we have made an island so that, that sanitary manhole is now in an island so it can be always accessible and obviously the building here is a great looking building. Andrea had a vision as to what she wanted it to look like and I feel we did a pretty good job of bringing that to life. She is ready to go and start construction as soon as possible.

We are probably looking to be able to start in April and be done by October or November ish time frame and be up and running before the end of the year. So that is the plan, short and sweet.

Mr. Casciani: The only thing and I am fine with it, is you just banking the parking spaces. Are you showing them on here?

David Cox: Yes. There are 14 land banked spaces

Mr. Casciani: Which one? What am I looking at?

David Cox: It's on the site plan. So, there is a couple spaces on the end, up top here.

Mr. Casciani: Ok, I see where you are at.

David Cox: 11 spaces on this side (showing on the plans) and one down here. They are kind of dashed in.

Mr. Casciani: Yeah, I think that is fine. There was a question on it if you did need more parking spaces, you should be the first one to put them in.

David Cox: Right.

Mr. Casciani: Ok, that's good. The building is great and looks good. We talked about that the last time, that was nice. A real nice-looking building. You got your variance and you have room in the back and you are away from the detention area. That leaves you room for future additions. I don't see any issues with it. Concerns with PRC you have addressed those.

David Cox: Yes

Mr. Casciani: Actually, this is a public hearing for anybody who is watching, will open the public hearing and you can call 872-7011 if you have any comments for or against this project. Mean while we can go around, does anybody have any concerns?

Mark Giardina: I hate to seem like the sign guy but are you going to come in for an application for the sign later after the building is put up.

David Cox: Yes, that will be a separate application.

Mark Giardina: You are going to have a monument sign in the front?

David Cox: No. No monument signs.

Mark Giardina: You are not going to use the existing monument sign?

Josh Artuso: There is an existing monument sign and they will have a slot.

Mr. Casciani: Yes, your sign would be out in the front up near the road.

David Cox: Correct.

Derek Anderson: The sign on here is that what she is proposing? (not speaking loud enough)
When she came in for concept a comment had been made that the sign was included in the final packet. INAUDIBLE

David Cox: Yes, that is the sign there.

Mr. Casciani: That was the one that was on the original drawing wasn't it?

David Cox: Yes

Mr. Casciani: So that is the only sign you have other then the one that is posted out in the monument?

David Cox: Yes

Mr. Casciani: Ok, anybody? Dave, anybody?

Board: Nothing

Mr. Casciani: Nothing? Wow, easy one.

Derek Anderson: Do you want to include the sign?

David Cox: Yes, we can include the sign.

Derek Anderson: I just figured, get it all done at once. Do you know any particulars about this?
How it is lit?

David Cox: It is back lit.

Derek Anderson: (not loud enough) that might be too bright because it is a big white sign

Mr. Casciani: Just make it to conform. If you can make it back lit.

David Cox: That was the plan if that is

Mr. Casciani: You can have it back lit, but you just must go by what the code is. The only thing it should show are the figures. The actual letters and the rest should be black or blue some color that doesn't emit light. Get away from the white glaring box.

David Cox: Yes, we can do that.

Mr. Casciani: Do what is in the code. Just follow that.

David Cox: ok.

Mr. Casciani: No one has called to complain or has an interest in it so we will close the public hearing. Derek, you ok with it anyone else.

Derek Anderson: With the sign, just INAUDIBLE it does show a big white box and INAUDIBLE

Mr. Casciani: You will have to put that into the resolution

David Cox: Yes, you can put in there

Derek Anderson: It is probably going to be INAUDIBLE and all you are going to see is The Village Vet and just black

David Cox: Yea, they do amazing things with signs now that at night they can black out whatever parts they want.

Raja Sekharan: So, he is now including the sign?

Mr. Casciani: Well, the sign was on the original drawing. The one on the building.

Raja Sekharan: Ok, I don't have a problem with that. I am just.... He said he is not including it Now.

David Cox: No, we are including it.

Mr. Casciani: Ok, want to do a SEQR on it?

Derek Anderson: Because the size of the building, this one is an UNLISTED ACTION.

MOTION FOR AN UNLISTED ACTION

The Town of Webster Planning Board considered the request by Applicant, Andrea Blitz to construct a 6,000 square foot veterinary office on a 1.44-acre parcel located at 40 Commons Boulevard, having SBL #079.16-1-24.232, in an MC Medium Intensity Commercial District.

The Planning Board determined that the proposed action is an Unlisted Action under Part 617: State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR).

The Planning Board determined that the action is subject to a single agency review pursuant to Part 617.6(b)(1) of SEQR and that it is the most appropriate agency for making the determination of significance. The Planning Board therefore designates itself lead agency for the proposed action.

The Planning Board has considered the criteria for determining significance as set forth in Section 617.7(c)(1) of SEQR, and has

1. considered the information contained in the Short Environmental Assessment Form Part 1 dated December 28, 2020,
2. considered public comments directed to the Planning Board during the Public Hearing on February 16, 2021 and
3. completed Part 2 of the Environmental Assessment Form.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the TOWN OF WEBSTER PLANNING BOARD hereby determines that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment for the reasons set forth in the attached Notice of Determination of Non-Significance; be it further,

RESOLVED that the TOWN OF WEBSTER PLANNING BOARD is authorized to take all actions reasonable and necessary to file the Negative Declaration and discharge the TOWN OF WEBSTER PLANNING BOARD'S responsibility as lead agency for this action, be it further,

RESOLVED that the TOWN OF WEBSTER PLANNING BOARD, based on the information and analysis above, the referenced supporting documentation, and discussions of the action by the TOWN OF WEBSTER PLANNING BOARD as documented by the Minutes for this meeting, that the proposed action WILL NOT result in any significant environmental impacts, be it further,

RESOLVED that the TOWN OF WEBSTER PLANNING BOARD, therefore makes a DETERMINATION OF NON-SIGNIFICANCE, be it further,

RESOLVED, that the TOWN OF WEBSTER PLANNING BOARD, based on the above reasons issues a NEGATIVE DECLARATION as evidence of its determination.

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF NON-SIGNIFICANCE

The Planning Board has reasonably concluded the following results from the proposed action, when compared against the criteria in Section 617.7(c):

1. The proposed action will not have a substantial adverse change in air quality since it does not include a regulated emission source.
2. The proposed action will not have a substantial adverse change in ground or surface water quality or quantity since the proposed action does not include on site wells or septic systems.
3. Water will be supplied by the Monroe County Water Authority which has adequate capacity to support the action.
4. Wastewater will be treated by the Town of Webster. The Town of Webster sewerage system and treatment plant have adequate capacity to treat the wastewater created by the proposed action.
5. The proposed action will not have a substantial adverse change in potential for erosion, flooding, leaching or drainage problems. Development will conform to NYSDEC for storm water management and control.

6. The proposed action will not have a substantial adverse change in existing solid waste production since the action does not contain processes that will significantly increase the amount of solid waste generated by similar facilities.
7. The proposed action will not have a substantial adverse change in existing noise, odor or light since the action is being developed in accordance with Town of Webster standards. A temporary increase in noise levels consistent with normal construction activities is anticipated when during construction.
8. The proposed action will not have a substantial adverse change, or cumulative change in traffic since the proposed action will not generate significant amounts of traffic when compared to existing traffic.
9. The proposed action will not have a substantial adverse impact on the criteria listed under Section 617(c)(1)(ii) of SEQR because no habitats or threatened or endanger species were identified on or contiguous to the proposed site.
10. The proposed action is not located in an area designated as a Critical Environmental Area by the Town of Webster or New York State pursuant to subdivision 617.14(g) of SEQR.
11. The proposed action is not in material conflict with the Town of Webster 2008 Comprehensive Plan.
12. The proposed action will not create an impairment of the criteria listed under Section 617(c)(1)(v) of SEQR since the action is not located in or adjacent to the listed resources and is in character with the surrounding community.
13. The action will not result in a major change in the type or use of energy since it is a veterinary hospital and is constant with the surrounding uses.
14. The action will not create a hazard to human health since the building will not include a process that produces hazardous waste.
15. The action will not create a substantial change in use of the land since the action is consistent with zoning for the land, the existing community character, and the Town of Webster 2008 Comprehensive Plan.
16. The action will not attract a large number of people for more than a few days when compared to taking no action since the action involves a pole barn in an area with similar uses.
17. The action will not create a cumulative impact on the environment as listed under 617(c)(1)(x), (xi), and (xii) of SEQR.

RESOLUTION 21-012

Mr. Anderson made a motion for **UNLISTED ACTION** which was seconded by Mr. Giardina.

VOTE:

Mr. Anderson	AYE
Mr. Arena	AYE
Mr. Kosel	AYE
Mr. Malta	AYE
Mr. Meixell	AYE
Mr. Casciani	AYE
Mr. Giardina	AYE

Mr. Casciani: Ok, we can do a Preliminary Approval on it. Do you have a landscape drawing in here?

David Cox: Yes

Mr. Casciani: You have it in there, that's ok. It's alright I just wanted it so that it is in the packet.

Raja Sekharan: Did you see materials?

Mr. Casciani: Oh, for the building?

Raja Sekharan: Yes

Mr. Casciani: No, they have done a really great job of constructing the building... yes, that is good. Ok, does someone want to make a motion for Preliminary?

RESOLUTION 21-013

Mr. Malta made a motion for **PRELIMINARY APPROVAL TO THE VILLAGE VET**; Located at 40 Commons Boulevard. Applicant Andrea Blitz associated with the proposed construction of a 6,000 SF veterinary office on a 1.44-acre parcel having SBL # 079.16-1-24.232 located in an MC Medium Intensity Commercial District under Section 228-8 of the Code of the Town of Webster which was seconded by Mr. Kosel.

VOTE:

Mr. Anderson	AYE
Mr. Arena	AYE
Mr. Kosel	AYE
Mr. Malta	AYE
Mr. Meixell	AYE
Mr. Casciani	AYE
Mr. Giardina	AYE

CONDITIONS:

1. Subject to PRC Comments
2. Subject to a Letter of Credit posted with the Town of Webster.
3. Subject to Monroe County Water Authority comments
4. Subject to the determination of the ZBA for requested variances.
5. All the improvements shall be constructed according to the specification of the Town of Webster.
6. All site work is to be in compliance with the standards of the Town of Webster.
7. Comply with all requirements of any Federal, State, County or Town agency.
8. Address drainage, lighting, signage, and landscaping, buffering, berming and snow storage.

9. The landscape, hardscape, site accessories, and associated finished grading design for the development must be prepared by a NYS licensed Landscape Architect. The final landscape plans shall bear the seal and signature of the Landscape Architect.
10. Approvals are subject to Drawing No: A-7.0 C102 Dated:
11. Proceed to Final Approval
12. The sign can be opaque with just the figures to be lit as shown on the drawing.

Mark Giardina: Did they get their variances already?

Mr. Casciani: Yes, they got their variances already.

Mark Giardina: That should be part of the conditions here.

Mr. Casciani: They did. Ok, we have a motion need a second. Ok, probably want a final too.
(LAUGHTER)

David Cox: Yes

RESOLUTION 21-014

Mr. Malta made a motion for **FINAL APPROVAL TO THE VILLAGE VET;** Located at 40 Commons Boulevard. Applicant Andrea Blitz associated with the proposed construction of a 6,000 SF veterinary office on a 1.44-acre parcel having SBL # 079.16-1-24.232 located in an MC Medium Intensity Commercial District under Section 228-8 of the Code of the Town of Webster which was seconded by Mr. Giardina.

VOTE:

Mr. Anderson	AYE
Mr. Arena	AYE
Mr. Kosel	AYE
Mr. Malta	AYE
Mr. Meixell	AYE
Mr. Casciani	AYE
Mr. Giardina	AYE

CONDITIONS:

1. Subject to PRC comments.
2. Subject to Preliminary Approval Conditions.
3. Subject to all applicable governmental fees.
4. Subject to Department of Public Works approval
5. Significant construction shall occur within one year, as deemed by the Planning Board, to expire on 2.16.22.

6. The conditions of Preliminary and Final approval are depicted on the cover page of the final designed plans.
7. The Engineer for the proposed project shall provide a Letter of Certification that all proposed work was completed, as per Planning Board resolution of final approval before a Certificate of Occupancy will be issued.
8. A Letter of Credit to the Town for the project shall include the fee for the Engineer's final certification inspection of the site.

Dave Malta: Do we have storm water facilities on that, I don't think so.

Mr. Casciani: I don't think so. You are not putting down spouts in there?

David Cox: No. It is ... the only storm water that is existing INAUDIBLE

Mr. Casciani: Your drainage from the building?

David Cox: It all goes to the storm water main.

9. All storm water facilities are to be constructed first
10. All downspouts to be connected to the storm sewer system.
11. Subject to resolution of the final approved minutes.
12. Approvals are subject to Drawing No: A-7.0 C102 Dated:

Mr. Casciani: Yes, 7 & 8 we have got to, we have been a little lax on that. That is the one you mentioned is *the conditions of Preliminary and Final approval are depicted on the cover page of the final designed plans*. So, when you have your drawing to go in for signatures, you need to have the approved Preliminary Final resolutions on that cover sheet and then number 8: *The Engineer's final certification inspection of the site*. So, when it's all done and you want to get your certificate of occupancy for the project, what you need to do is verify that everything that the contractors and everybody has completed everything they way it was supposed to be done.

David Cox: Ok.

Mr. Casciani: So, you're just certifying that everything was done properly.

David Cox: Got it.

Mr. Casciani: Because a lot of times that stuff is getting neglected from one department to the other you kind of lose it, you know. It shows up later and it becomes an issue so. Anyways, those are the main ones to be concerned with.

Dave Arena read the third application:

PROPOSED JIFFY LUBE: Located at 1161, 1171, 1173-1175 Ridge Road & 974 Jackson Road. Applicant Bohler Engineering is requesting **SKETCH PLAN REVIEW** of a 3,000 SF Jiffy Lube service station on a proposed .84-acre parcel consisting of the above referenced addresses having SBL #'s 080.13-2-1, 080.13-2-2, 080.13-2-3.1, & 080.13-2-52 located in an

MC Medium Intensity Commercial District under Section 228-4 of the Code of the Town of Webster.

Appearing before the board was Jerry Goldman. I am the attorney and agent for Guggenheim Development who is looking to develop the south east corner of Ridge Road and Jackson Road into a Jiffy Lube location. With us this evening is John Marth from Guggenheim Development to my immediate left and the Project Engineer is Chris Boyea from Bohler Engineering. Again, we are here this evening on a concept review and our concept review this evening is to essentially subdivide the immediate corner for this Jiffy Lube location. (not at the mic) This is part of the property (showing on the plans) which is owned by Ridge Road Webster LLC and the remainder of the property is going to be, as shown here, there is a house which is on INAUDIBLE which is going to stay. There are 2 houses which are going to disappear and 2 lots with Ridge Road frontage and with an adjustment of lot lines INAUDIBLE the Jiffy Lube parcel. That parcel is likely is less than 25,000 square feet which is required in INAUDIBLE and for that reason we will need an area variance for that in addition, I am just going to hold onto the microphone and in addition, we will be applying for a use variance to allow the use as a Jiffy Lube at this corner. It's INAUDIBLE to be an automotive type use which is not a permitted use in the MC district. However, there really is something nice about this particular use on this corner and that is, that the Jiffy Lube operation is a traffic desert if you will. There is no intensity of traffic on the site. The average number of cars that are utilizing the Jiffy Lube facility typically is between 30-35 a day as opposed to if this were a standard MC use it could be 30-35 cars per hour and that is really the benefit of this particular use at this location.

So, Jiffy Lube itself has moved into the Rochester market with their newest development is an INAUDIBLE center. There is a location in Henrietta which is in an out parcel in front of Regal Theater which the site, which I believe is a smaller one than this one in the Town of Irondequoit along the Ridge Road area. This site is a state-of-the-art facility. The one thing that I think is very good from a Ridge Road perspective is that the building, the loading is going east west along here so to that extent, the building facade and building frontage along Ridge Road is solid and there are no garage doors which are shown. As we go through for site plan approval, we will be talking about treatment along the area but as you can see, we have a very large amount of green space on this particular site where we have ample room to be able to do what we need to do on the site. Access to the site, will be from, two curb cuts, one from Ridge Road and one on Jackson Road which is also a substantial benefit from the existing condition which had multiple curb cuts on Ridge Road, and I believe it has at least one on Jackson Road so to that extent, we are doing our part. As we go forward, we will have to have the review Monroe County of Transportation as Jackson Road being a county road and Ridge Road of course being a state road we have NY State DOT being a part of this.

As we indicated as you have in your packets and with the application material, we had some early design on our elevations we know the town designed guidelines are looking for a little something different and we are going to be working on that to try and get it done but the building would have the wanes coat on the lower level which has a particular architectural design and then the upper level, would also be somewhat different. We are talking about darker earth tone on the site because we think that is in keeping with the development which has occurred along the Ridge Road corridor with this being heavily considered relative to this and we will

be prepared to discuss that further when we come back for formal site plan approval assuming that we get the variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

So, part of our object here this evening is to gather any input that we can get from the board relative to the concept and, we would request that the board give a favorable recommendation for this use as one which is essentially consistent with a lot of the uses along this part of Ridge Road. There is Royal Car Wash there is also automotive facility that is further down across the street on Ridge Road just before we hit the Village but the key element of all of that is the fact that I think it is everyone's desire that we have a low traffic generator on any of these intersections because that was really the key to what we are doing on this site.

I don't know if John or Chris has anything to add before we open it up to any comments or questions the board may have.

Mr. Casciani: Just one questions Jerry. You needed a variance, what was it a use variance and the other was the other one?

Jerry Goldman: We need an area variance because our lot INAUDIBLE of 45,000 square foot lot We have a lot which is somewhere in the high 30's, I don't recall exactly what the number is . I Think 34,000 or there about and the reason why is because we have residential housing that exists over here with an existing building that is here (showing on the plans) so it is a practical matter that we are kind of boxed in terms of what this lot size is but again, we are not skimping by any means, because of the amount of greenspace that we really have on this sight. It is not like we are shoe horning anything in. Typically, we see these Jiffy Lubes on a lot smaller parcels then the parcel we are talking about here.

Mark Giardina: INAUDIBLE.

Jerry Goldman: DESIGN

Mark Giardina: Oh, design... I am sorry.

Jerry Goldman: We will be coming back to the board with sign guidelines and we do show some on the draft elevations at least submitted with the application and will be doing an analysis of whether it total conforms to code or whether it needs any relief or variances, but we will be taking a more critical look at that as we move onto the next stage.

Mark Giardina: That was the point that I was going to bring up tonight is that I just thought that there is an awful lot of signs and again, I hate to sound like Mr. Sign guy tonight but there seems like an awful lot of signs for one building and especially when you are talking about the front elevation. You have the Jiffy Lube and then you got the Pennzoil and I don't know if that would be considered another separate sign or not so that is just something....

Jerry Goldman: That is something that we will review. I don't know if the measurement of the sign constitutes a box around the entire element or whether each piece of it. I believe that the code talks about that we may need a variance for second elevation. We are talking about a

monument as well which is permitted under the code so that will be coming back as part of the site plan not site plan application review. So, thanks for that comment Mark.

Mr. Casciani: What does the code say, you must have 35,000 square feet? Is that the number?

Josh Artuso: 45 for MC

Mr. Casciani: 45 and what have you got Jerry, 30?

Jerry Goldman: 34,936 but we are really boxed in. There is not much we can do because we are going to need a side setback variance over here for the house and this building is very close in that location.

Mr. Casciani: On that drawing right where you had your finger, go to the south of the property and now go to back to the west where the property line is there, there is like a jog in it. What am I looking at there?

Jerry Goldman: I am not sure, but it may have something to do with the easement. Oh, the shed. There is an existing shed which exists over here, and we are trying not to disturb the remainder Of the property and that is what is really causing the, that is what is really causing what we are doing.

Mr. Casciani: That little shed that is on... It's on the easement there, isn't it?

Jerry Goldman: I am not exactly sure where the sewer line is within the easement. We show a center line but I am not sure exactly where it is. I trust that the shed is not sitting on the easement but that is something I think we will probably figure out as we move forward.

Mr. Casciani: Well the easement is the whole width, right?

Jerry Goldman: Yes, the easement is the whole width, but the shed is pre-existing I really don't know when that sewer easement came in and for what purpose. I am not sure what was there first.

Mr. Casciani: What kind of a shed is it? Is it a good shed or?? What I am getting at is another words, just to minimize your variance if you could move that. It looks like it is probably about 5 foot that jog maybe.

Jerry Goldman: It's 4.3

Mr. Casciani: Well that's a good guess. So, if you moved it up and you got another 4 foot by the length of that ...

Jerry Goldman: You would have another 500 square feet

Mr. Casciani: You would almost have or be a whole lot closer to what, somewhat closer anyways. Somewhat closer to what you would require the square footage would be. Your minimizing it anyways.

Jerry Goldman: We understand that.

Mr. Casciani: I don't know how important the shed is or if it is.

INAUDIBLE... (someone talking without a mic).

John Mark: Yes, really, I think it is simple. It's part of a retained lot and the shed was there in existence so we were just trying to put a small jog in the property line to sort of give that shed a little bit of space off the new property line. That was really the only intention there I think so.

Jerry Goldman: INAUDIBLE. We would have to ask the existing property owner what his feeling is and try and work with that and see if we can come up with something but. If we have another 5,000 square feet, we are still just shy of 40 so we would be in a variance situation in any event.

Mr. Casciani: I am surprised that they didn't have the shed further south and not on the easement area but.

Jerry Goldman: Like I said, I am not sure who showed up first. I am not sure the shed was there first or the easement was there first. From the looks of the site, it looks like almost everything was there before anything else was there.

Mr. Casciani: Anyways. There was a comment in there from highway, there it is. Anyway, it was the island can not stick out into the right of ways. You got that right?

Jerry Goldman: We will design and one thing, Josh shared with us about the DEC comments and that was one of them and we can certainly address that and keep it out of the right of way and take care of that. The other two were technical. They sounded more technical then something the board would consider.

Mr. Casciani: Yes, correct.

Dave Arena: The ingress and egress going onto Jackson Road. Is there anyway to do something like what is on Ridge? The reason I say that is I go down that street all the time and have a car come out and to the left going south and it's always a killer amount of traffic there. Is there any restriction. Do you understand what I am saying?

Jerry Goldman: We are anticipating. Well certainly again, we would have to review it with count DOT because it's there and near the intersection but part of the issue is, you want to trave south on Jackson ok coming out of here, the other alternative would be to come out to Ridge Road and we are basically looking to restrict left turns out and I don't know how you get there.

Dave Arena: Yeah you can't go left you have to go around the block.

Jerry Goldman: Well, you would have to go up here (showing on the map) and down and around and everything else and again for 35 cars a day and I don't know how many cars we are going to have that are going to be coming.

Derek Anderson: So, do you have the board that has the existing site on it? I am kind of looking at them side by side. Because on your existing site you have the 3 parcels showing and the 2 frame house that is on this lot #2, right now you are showing that house at 33 for setback from the side property line and then the house that is on lot 52 that looks like 31-34 foot setback from its north property line and with the subdivision and how you are combining the lots, recreating the lot for this thing now you are creating an existing lot that has an 8.3 setback from an existing structure on Ridge Road and then I don't see the distance on hand for the dwelling that is on Jackson Road. With this subdivision are you going to have to seek variances for the existing houses?

Jerry Goldman: Yes, I mentioned that we were going to seek a side setback variance for this house.

Derek Anderson: What about the one on Ridge Road?

Jerry Goldman: Ridge Road is a pre-existing property line INAUDIBLE (both parties speaking at the same time)

Derek Anderson: Not according to the map on the left there, it is showing that you have. Oh, that's the house you are getting rid of, so it does have INAUDIBLE 8.3

Jerry Goldman: This line is the same, so it is pre-existing.

Someone in audience speaking: INAUDIBLE

Derek Anderson: INAUDIBLE variances it is not only variances on one side setback for the proposed development, but you are also seeking variances on the other combined lot.

Jerry Goldman: One variance and the logic with this one, in terms of what we need over here is that the objective is to try to move this curb cut as far away from the intersection as we possibly can. Again, for traffic and safety reasons. This house currently, I believe, a rental which is owned by the property owner of the remainder over here and of course he has signed off on that relative to the site.

Derek Anderson: Now we have seen a couple different proposals at this intersection before. The biggest thing is the hindrance of the sewer easement that is across it. Everyone of them calls for the one lot and the one house that is remaining on Ridge Road they always try to show that as being demolished and taken away if this is granted the setback variance for that house how would that affect the future development for that lot?

Jerry Goldman: This lot on this side?

Derek Anderson: Right if you were to start tearing down the buildings INAUDIBLE (both parties speaking at the same time)

Jerry Goldman: The remaining lot does have a fair amount of frontage and we have no sense of what may or may not happen. The issue for this property owner is has been unable to get any traction with any site. I am familiar with the fact that there have been prior applications for the overall site and for lots of reasons they have not worked but again, the main feature is that we are taking almost an acre and turning it into a use that really is not generating a whole lot of traffic or a whole lot of activity.

Derek Anderson: Well it's not our board it's the Zoning Board. If they every granted a variance specifically, to this type of thing then any future development

Mr. Casciani: Well your point is well taken because that leaves just that lot and it is connecting to that other parcel to the east and there is not room to put up a building. It can not be divided into separate lots. This would be a self-created hard ship by doing this. For future development whoever owns the rest of the property.

Derek Anderson: I guess what I am wondering more is if we give them the variance for that then the next owner comes in and tears everything down and then we already have a variance for an 8-foot setback and building on his property line is that still applicable for future development.

Jerry Goldman: Once the building goes the setback doesn't INAUDIBLE

Mr. Casciani: Yes, there must be a foundation there. Help me out, rear elevations, side elevations and front, what the heck am I looking at rear elevation I am assuming is...

Dave Malta: Second side elevation

Mr. Casciani: Is the east side? (everyone talking at once)

Chris Boyea: I can walk you through its real quick Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Casciani: Elevation is the east side? Is that what I am looking at?

Chris Boyea: So, this might help so the, I actually have to orientate myself here. So, this Elevation rear elevation I think it might be, embarrassingly, it is mislabeled. That is not the real Elevation if I am standing on Jackson Road INAUDIBLE. If I am standing on Jackson Road and looking at the building and that is what I am seeing. Everything else falls into place so my apologies. We will make sure we get that updated. Sorry about that.

Mr. Casciani: So that is the west rear elevation, the rear elevation is the west elevation.

Applicant: Correct.

John Kosel: On the side elevation INAUDIBLE (both parties talking at the same time)

Mr. Casciani: The front elevation is the front entrance going into it which is really the east elevation

Chris Boyea: The left, the second row the one on the left INAUDIBLE (both parties talking at the same time) is what faces Ridge Road.

Mr. Casciani: Side elevation would be Ridge Road

Chris Boyea: The first one yes that is Ridge Road.

Mr. Casciani: So, that is the north elevation and side elevation with the ladder is the south elevation.

Chris Boyea: Yes sir

Mr. Casciani: Alright, so with that said. The north elevation. I think maybe do some home work on that thing. It really looks like the back of the building; you know what I mean? You don't have a window in there it's just block. There is nothing there that is attractive in my opinion anyways.

Derek Anderson: That is the predominant one seen from Ridge Road.

Mr. Casciani: Yes, exactly.

Chris Boyea: We will look at making some.

Mr. Casciani: Your west elevation looks good. Those doors, what are you using different kind of doors? It's kind of a neat looking door.

Chris Boyea: So, these doors are a steel door with glass so the whole thing is glass panels And a steel door and that is mostly because of the INAUDIBLE values that we must get for comp check. They prefer aluminum but the insulated value but yes, it's all glass.

Mr. Casciani: Over your doors on the west elevation like little INAUDIBLE over them, those red things.

Chris Boyea: Yes, so actually those are supposed to be and again, I am a little embarrassed to say this, these are actually supposed to be signs and again, going back to signs they are supposed to have, it tells the driver what service. Like these first 2 are the oil change bays and then these are supposed to be different and it is just a small white letter here and they didn't show that so they have some of this stuff backwards.

INAUDIBLE

Mr. Casciani: Well try and think what you need to do. I think what is going to help is minimizing some of the signs. You don't want to have signs over every window and door and all over the place.

Chris Boyea: Understood.

Mr. Casciani: They will not be too appealing to the Zoning Board.

Derek Anderson: So, the way that you have it shown, the big Jiffy Lube and the Pennzoil that is the façade that is mirrored imaged?

Chris Boyea: Correct

Derek Anderson: So, you can see from Jackson Road

Chris Boyea: My architect is going to get a phone call after this meeting (LAUGHTER) So, the signage is what we normally would like and obviously understand that there is going to be some reduction and some concessions made on signage but yes, this sign package is what typically go in with and will have to make some reductions here but yes, INAUDIBLE (everyone talking at once)

Derek Anderson: It is what you would see on the mirrored image.

Chris Boyea: Correct

Derek Anderson: So, the top one up there because that is a west facing one, I got to wonder why it would have... It's mirrored image but the Jiffy Lube is actually facing east and makes me wonder the need for that. INAUDIBLE it's almost like a monument sign on the road when you are driving down because the only people that would see that would be in the INAUDIBLE.

Chris Boyea: Yes, I am going to retract and correct my statement, this is good now it's all becoming clear. So, this is actually this is the front elevation however is was not supposed to be mirrored. So, this is what we call the customer side of the building. In this layout, the customer side of the building belongs over here (showing on the plans) so this is actually and again, I apologize to the board. We will get this remedied, but this actually faces Jackson Road this side. This is the rear of the building with the service entrance and the car drives up in the back of the site, they know which bay to enter for what they are looking for. So, again...

Mr. Casciani: They are just backwards that's all.

Chris Boyea: Correct.

Mr. Casciani: You are messing with us tonight, aren't you... (LAUGHTER)

Chris Boyea: Believe me, Mr. Chairman, that is the last thing I wanted to do tonight.

Mr. Casciani: Well I think, it sounds like the board is ok with this project, but you need to fine tune to do what ever you need to do to make it work. You have to get your variances and what have you.

Derek Anderson: Just on the site plan you have a monument sign that is 10 feet off the Jackson Road right of way and I don't think that is going to fly.

Mr. Casciani: Where are you Derek?

Derek Anderson: On the site plan they have a proposed sign, it's a monument sign and it is 22 feet off of Ridge Road but it is only 10 feet off Jackson Road and in that same area too there is... You have your water service running through your proposed green space and storm water management area. What do you envision, as a stormwater management area? Is it sub-service, it is clearly not a pond? Sub-service chambers?

Chris Boyea: Yes, for the record, I am Chris Boyea with Bohler Engineering and we are very Fortunate on this site from a storm water point so there is a lot of good things from an Engineering standpoint on this site. 1. It is a re-development site and it has a lot of properties on there right now and we will be removing some of those and cleaning that up. 2. There are 4 lots or reducing the number of lots here so the lots in general are going to get consolidated and sorted out. 3. This size development that we are trying to put here is very small so again, the overall lot is I think .84 acres. So, it's small and as Jerry mentioned, a lot of green space here so from a storm water standpoint, it's re-development; less then an acre and got a lot of green space here so it is not a heavy lift on this for storm water. We will probably be able to solve it all with surface because of those credits that are there. Connection wise, ultimately it will be a pipe that connects. Right now, there is drainage that comes out this way (showing on the plans) and this is all of the water and so we will maintain that flow with the design.

So, tonight I know your architect has put those elevations together. We just wanted to give the board a flare for the project. What's it going to look like, the scope scale. There is a lot of detail that I will have to get into to and I know the first challenge that we have is use variance. That can be scary and before we do too much and talk about oak trees or cherry trees, lilac bushes, that is a big hurdle for us to get through is that use variance but certainly there will be even more detail with the storm water.

Derek Anderson: Is that sewer sanitary or storm?

Chris Boyea: It is just sanitary.

Derek Anderson: So, you wouldn't be able to tie the storm into it.

Chris Boyea: There is a storm line here, but I think the easement you are talking about is sanitary.

Mark Giardina: Can we go back to the west elevation for just a moment because I have a question. Above the garage doors, is that all one color? You see what I am talking about?

Chris Boyea: All of this brick is one color here and there may be some shading in there that you are seeing but it is not intentional to have different brick than what is there.

Mark Giardina: Because I have on mine, I have a dark red and then it looks like an orange underneath.

Mr. Casciani: That is the piece where we were talking about.

Mark Giardina: What about the lights then there? The lights look like they are pointing outward instead of down.

Chris Boyea: They are not lights; they are actually scuppers.

Mr. Casciani: Drainage scuppers on the roof

Chris Boyea: Just an additional point, as far as lighting goes, we are basically a standard and what I am going to call, standard business hours. Typically, we are a 9-5 or a 9-6 kind of operation so the lighting on the site, we actually don't propose site lighting other than anything on the building for emergency and safety purposes at night, that's it. So, there is not any lights that are INAUDIBLE

Mr. Casciani: Parking and stuff

Chris Boyea: Yes, we don't. We are closed basically during nighttime hours. So, just something to point out to the board, there won't be a site that is lit up 24 hours a day here. We are a day time operation predominantly.

Mr. Casciani: Alright, the next step is to the ZBA now

INAUDIBLE... (someone speaking)

Mr. Casciani: That is up to the board. What do you guys think?

Dave Malta: I think it is a great use for that corner.

Mr. Casciani: I agree with you.

Dave Malta: It is not a noisy thing and it's not a lot of INAUDIBLE. We have seen so many things come in on that corner, gas stations and plaza's and what not. Restaurant type stuff so I think it is a perfect use for that corner.

Mr. Casciani: I agree. So, the question then, you guys want to have a letter sent to the Zoning Board? What do you want to do? You tell me. If you want the letter, I will do a letter with Katherine tomorrow.

Board: All agreed to send letter to Zoning Board. (everyone talking)

Derek Meixell: INAUDIBLE facing the front of the building.

Mr. Casciani: What is that?

Derek Meixell: Doing something more exciting on the front of the building.

INAUDIBLE (everyone talking at once)

Mr. Casciani: Yes, make sure the ladders are in the back. (LAUGHTER)

Applicant: Will put the front in the front and the back in the back

Mr. Casciani: Yeah, that is what I am wondering. I didn't want to sound stupid, but I am looking as I am trying to figure out what is the front and what is the back. (LAUGHTER)

INAUDIBLE

Mr. Casciani: Ok, you guys are all set. Ok, fellows will see you. Good Luck!

Dave Arena read the fourth application:

ROCHESTER LINOLEUM PLAZA PARKING LOT EXPANSION: Located at 1170 Ridge Road. Applicant Dave Spoleta is requesting a **SITE PLAN MODIFICATION (PUBLIC HEARING)** of a previously approved site plan to allow the construction of 27 additional parking spaces on a 3.05-acre parcel having SBL # 080.09-3-1.31 located in an MC Medium Intensity Commercial District under Section 228-8 of the Code of the Town of Webster.

Appearing before the board was David Spoleta representing application for Dr. Giangreco. He cannot make it here tonight. He wants to buy the plaza INAUDIBLE (not using the mic) and he wants to put in another 35-4,000 foot of office space for his orthodontist office. So, it is vital for him to add these parking spots. He can not operate without these parking spots and I think it is crucial for the plaza. I think the plaza is in ICU right now. It is struggling and Dr. Giangreco he is stepping up to buy the plaza and I think it will revitalize the plaza. I think the plaza will, with these parking spots, will gain some INAUDIBLE.

Derek Anderson: I am sorry, I didn't catch your name.

David Spoleta: I am David Spoleta. So, with this, I propose, and I am also going to do the construction. I own Spoleta Construction and I am going to be doing the construction for Dr. Giangreco. So, I propose to put in 27 parking spaces, 2 more handicap with a versa lock retaining wall.

Mr. Casciani: How much Did you see the comments that PRC had?

David Spoleta: No Tony

Mr. Casciani: You know what it was Dave, move the one from the east side, a few of them. Can you move them over to the west side because there is more distance from the road?

David Spoleta: Yes

Mr. Casciani: Do you see what I'm saying? That would keep more green at the east side.

David Spoleta: I could probably move 2 spots.

Mr. Casciani: Yes, 2-3 what ever it comes out and whatever works. It just gives that much more clearance.

David Spoleta: No problem.

Mr. Casciani: What is it, 225 feet.

David Spoleta: It's about 225 feet.

Mr. Casciani: Yes. If it helps the project to move forward, I don't have an issue with that.

David Spoleta: He just can't operate without those parking spots and obviously for the future of this project, obviously he wants to get tenants and fill the plaza. If Dr. Giangreco does not does not buy this project, this structure, I don't know what is going to happen to this structure it's just in trouble. This truly is a problem.

Mr. Casciani: I think it is a minor change if you can get the place to be usable again.

Derek Anderson: How high is this retaining wall?

Mr. Casciani: It's only a couple feet.

David Spoleta: It is 3 courses. It is only 28 inches with the cap.

Mr. Casciani: And there is a drawing number in there too.

Derek Anderson: It is just a product bulletin

David Spoleta: Yes, versa lock it's a structural retaining wall. Its structural rebar integrity to the block. I will also put a drain tile wrapped in fabric with stone behind it and it doesn't call for it but it is just extra protection. INAUDIBLE (not using mic) on the east and west stone and obviously just run off with rip-rap.

Derek Anderson: I understand the need for the lot and to make the space more usable. I do have a little concern about how close it is to the state right of way. It is not that big of an excavation, it's a couple of feet but it's a decent distance

David Spoleta: It is 3 feet more INAUDIBLE and backfill.

Derek Anderson: The level of detail on this, it almost... it really needs an Engineer plan.

David Spoleta: It is a pretty simple concept.

Derek Anderson: Especially since it is something that is being submitted to a municipality for an approval and unless you are a licensed Engineer

David Spoleta: I am not.

Derek Anderson: Ok, then you understand that this is a license drawing by a credited Engineer that you are modifying to show your plan. I really think you should have an Engineered plan for this so we have a clear understanding on how this thing is going to be built and the impact it will have on the edge of the right of way and DOT even has a concern if there is a closeness for the drop off there.

David Spoleta: There is still a lot of green space between here and the sidewalk. (showing on plans) There is quite a bit especially over here. There is probably, I would say another 35-40 feet to the edge of the pavement, the retaining wall. There is still a lot of green space, a lot of grass.

Mr. Casciani: That was part of the reason I was suggesting take the last 2-3 parking spaces to the east and bring them up around the corner of the west side. That is where the sharpest bend in the road is if you will. That would keep a more consistent setback similar more like to the middle you know.

David Spoleta: I could bring a few spaces to the left

Mr. Casciani: Those 3 up at the other end and I don't know what's up there. I see a bunch of squares there but I don't know what they are. Nothing, I guess. That is where there was a house at one time.

David Spoleta: INAUDIBLE. there is a sign right there

Mr. Casciani: If they could be moved that way, I think that

David Spoleta: We can move a couple spots that way, 2-3 spots.

Mr. Casciani: That would bring you right up to where that arrow shows there but I don't know what the scale is. INAUDIBLE. 40 feet. It's hard to really figure out. This is the edge of the roadway right here so it looks like you would have about 30 feet maybe, something like that from the edge of the

David Spoleta: You have about 30-35 feet roughly. Over here you have about 20 feet. If we take 2 out of here will have about 20 feet or over here about 35 feet.

Mr. Casciani: Is that going to require a variance Josh?

Josh Artuso: For the parking, NO.

Mr. Casciani: Ok. I don't know, what do you guys think?

Dave Malta: I think it is fine as far.... I can see a definite need and they probably should of done that right from the beginning. INAUDIBLE (someone talking at the same time) parking because this slows down, and the rear parking is in the lower level. Makes a lot of sense to put additional parking in front.

Mr. Casciani: So, you basically are cutting what about 20 feet into the bank.

David Spoleta: 20 feet correct. Ill excavate probably 20-22, 23 feet, obviously back fill it, I'll sod I'll put the cap in and sod and come right back down and sod it

Mr. Casciani: Do you see what I am referring to there? Derek, Dave? If you take those ones where it is tight on the east end, just transfer those over to the west end by the curve there, that would give them more consistent depth. I don't know, you are thinking they need an Engineers drawing. What is the sense in that?

Derek Anderson: Well this is an application for a modification for a site plan and site plans by our town code are prepared by a licensed Engineer and Mr. Spoleta is not and this is not an Engineer drawing. It is a nice concept drawing. Have them contact Passero and have them put together Engineered plans showing the details taking with the comments and then that is something we can consider. I understand the need for it and I really don't have an objection to the project itself, what I have an objection to is that it is a submittal and not into conformance with our own town code. So, INAUDIBLE

Mr. Casciani: Have him make a sketch up

David Spoleta: I can do that. I am trying to save INAUDIBLE obviously

Derek Anderson: I understand what you are doing but INAUDIBLE (both parties talking at the same time)

David Spoleta: I can have them make a sketch

Derek Anderson: Yes, we want somebody to take the liability for the land

David Spoleta: No problem. I can have Passero draw something up.

Mr. Casciani: Have them show exactly what you are doing, showing the 3 over.

David Spoleta: You got it, no problem.

Mr. Casciani: Ok, this project is a public hearing and will open it. So, if anyone has any concern regarding this project you can call in 872-7011. It would be good to get that place re-occupied before it does go to heck.

David Spoleta: It needs it. It's time.

Derek Anderson: It's been 2 years since no one has been in there?

David Spoleta: It has been emptied for 2 years. You know, Dr. Giangreco is a good friend of mine and obviously as a friend to help him. Obviously, I am in the business a developer and contractor and I said to Terry, I go Terry, I said you can not buy this project, you just can't do it. It's dead for this reason and I am sure the town does not want a dead project and the suffering like this.

Mr. Casciani: There are a couple of tenants in there right now.

David Spoleta: INAUDIBLE. Tenants in there but you know, he has some work to do and the lease's are coming up and he's nervous. So, we have to get the lease's signed and obviously the parking. I really think that it really can be a successful plaza.

Mr. Casciani: Why don't you... who did this, Passero...yes. Why don't you have them just make you a sketch of the whole thing.

David Spoleta: Yes, as a matter of fact, thank you for approving The Vet. We will be building the vet.

Mr. Casciani: Oh, you are doing that. That is a nice-looking building.

David Spoleta: Yes, it is a nice-looking building. She is a good person.

Mr. Casciani: Have Passero make a drawing

David Spoleta: Yes, I talked to David outside and he'll do it.

Mr. Casciani: That is probably something they can do quickly.

Raja Sekharan: INAUDIBLE

Mr. Casciani: Well, I don't know what they are planning on or how quick they can get it. When do you want to come back in?

David Spoleta: I would like to. So, we won't be able to get approval tonight?

Mr. Casciani: No, you should get the drawing first.

David Spoleta: So, we have to wait another couple week? When is the next meeting?

Raja Sekharan: March 2. Do you think you could get in before then?

David Spoleta: I think I can get it in before March 2, yes.

Raja Sekharan: INAUDIBLE March 16th.

David Spoleta: That will be 2 weeks before?

INAUDIBLE. (every speaking at the same time)

Josh Artuso: Well for the next hearing I have to prepare ...

David Spoleta: What I could probably do is

Mr. Casciani: What is that?

Josh Artuso: Friday is when I prepare the agenda for the next meeting. I mean I can go just by the description if we have confirmation that they can get it to us.

Raja Sekharan: For March 16th, the filing deadline is March 1st.

David Spoleta: March 1st? Is there one coming up March 2nd?

Raja Sekharan: Yes, but the according to our schedule it is February 16th, today.

David Spoleta: Can I put it on the agenda and have it by this Friday and try and get you a drawing by this Friday and have it on the agenda for March 2?

Josh Artuso: I don't have a problem; it is already been advertised once so as long as the description hasn't changed, which it doesn't sound like it is, I don't think that will be a problem.

David Spoleta: I will have it done. I will have it to Josh by Friday and Tony, I am going to move a couple spaces to the west.

Mr. Casciani: That will give you a little bit more room. We will close the public hearing but we will keep the public hearing open for this project for the March 2 date.

With no other applications before the Board this evening Mr. Casciani concluded tonight's meeting at 8:30 pm.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER: Minutes were approved for February 2, 2021 meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Signed David C. Arena Sec. Dated 4/6/2021

David C. Arena, Secretary
Katherine Kolich, Recording Secretary

APR 14 '21 AM 6:53
FILED WEBSTER TWN CLK
Douglas M. Maguire

