

## WEBSTER TOWN PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

PLACE: Webster Town Board Meeting Room 1002 Ridge Road

TIME: 7:00 p.m.

DATE: 15 June 2021

### PRESENT:

Anthony Casciani, Chairman

Dave Malta, Vice Chairman

Dave Arena, Secretary

Derek Anderson

Mark Giardina

John Kosel

Raja Sekharan, Attorney

Josh Artuso, Director of Community Development

Katherine Kolich, Recording Secretary

### ABSENT:

Derek Meixell

## APPEARANCE BEFORE THE BOARD

### Summary overview of outcome:

#### Jiffy Lube

Applicant: 1161 Ridge Road

Drawing: N/A

Dated: N/A

Revision: N/A

Status: **Granted Final Approval: 3 Signs total allowed: sign on north elevation (center); sign on west elevation; and one monument sign.**

Mr. Casciani welcomed everyone to tonight's meeting of the Planning Board of June 15, 2021. This is a short agenda we only have one item on it. Hopefully we are done kind of early.

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

Mr. Casciani: Again, we just have the one Jiffy Lube project.

#### Dave Arena read the first application:

**PROPOSED JIFFY LUBE:** Located at 1161 & 1171, Ridge Road & 974 Jackson Road.

Applicant Bohler Engineering is requesting **FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEW (PUBLIC HEARING)** associated with the construction of a 3,000 SF Jiffy Lube auto care facility 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 Caryn Mlodzianowski from Bohler Engineering and I am here presenting Guggenheim Development Services LLC for this proposed Jiffy Lube project. Since we were here just 2 weeks ago and went through everything in detail, I will just give a quick update of everything new since the last meeting.

When we were here we were asked to provide signage information for the project so there will be one monument sign which will be compliant in size (not using the mic) and setback out perpendicular to Ridge Road at the intersection up here and when we were here 2 weeks ago, we had building signs on all four sides of the building as all four are visible from a road way due to the fact that we are at an intersection so in reviewing the code in order to make it compliant at this point we are proposing a wall sign on the (not using the mic) west side and it would face Jackson Road. This version is slightly different then what was submitted which was this, which shows one side having that sign. When we calculate the square footage allowed for the wall sign it is about 186 square feet and we are just under 32 square feet so we are significantly under the allowance for the size of sign so we did keep it small and that area is calculated by adding all parts of the sign you see here (showing on the plans).

I am also showing a sign on the north side which faces Ridge Road which was not included on the submittal. The reason for that is we are only allowed one wall sign per the code so I did want to show that and ask if the board could consider waiving the option to have a second wall sign on that side because we are so far under the allowable square footage and it just helps enhance that wall that is there . We also received PRC comments which were formally able to respond and address and that was included in the letter that you received last week and we also received the County comments which we were waiting on to officially be able to do a final decision here this evening. So, not a lot of plan changes mainly signage was the main thing and receiving those County comments. It looks like the County did refer to you for the final site plan approval. So, with that, I will turn it back over to the board.

Mr. Casciani: When we were talking as I was speaking to you a few minutes ago about that front north elevation it just has those 3 windows down below and it does look blah because there is nothing there you know and I was suggesting artificial windows or something like that so it doesn't make it look like a large gymnasium wall. If the sign was there, I don't have an issue with it but what would they have to do, get another variance for another sign?

Josh Artuso: Actually, I did just find this prevision in the code, if I am interrupting correctly, gives the Planning Board the authority to approve the number of signs if it is being considered as part of site plan approval.

Raja Sekharan: What is the code section?

Josh Artuso: 178-7d

Mr. Casciani: So, the sign you are proposing for there is that the one we have here (holding up picture) like this?

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Yes, it would be the same size and I will bring this closer. (no mic) This is the one submitted and then this is the one we would add.

Mr. Casciani: Ok, this is the same one that I have here.

Caryn Mlodzianowski: And we would leave the other 2 blank.

Dave Malta: It might look better in the middle of the wall.

Mr. Casciani: Exactly, I agree Dave. If it is centered it will take up that space. Either that or something because it is just... Looking at this elevation here is just bland looking.

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Understood.

Mr. Casciani: I don't have an issue with the sign, if the code allows it and that is really where you want it because it is right on Ridge Road and you can see it.

Raja Sekharan: I would have to agree with Josh, 178-7d, I never seen this before to be honest. A little bit down, the number of signs may be approved by the Planning Board.

Mr. Casciani: Ok, so in a case like that

Raja Sekharan: It says in addition, the Planning Board was prescribing the number, hours of operation, location, color, materials, design, illumination, and general character of each sign concurring with subdivision or site plan approval. So, it looks like all the authority is invested with the Planning Board then.

Mr. Casciani: Nice fine Josh.

Josh Artuso: I just learned that myself. That is a good one.

Mr. Casciani: You fellows ok with the signs?

Mark Giardina: We are talking about 2 signs now?

Mr. Casciani: Yes, there will be 2 signs now. One on the west side and one on the north side.

Mark Giardina: The north side you want in the middle of the building?

Mr. Casciani: I think it should be in the center. I agree with Dave. If it is center it looks right but if it is shoved over to the left like that, it's still a blank wall.

Mark Giardina: It is going to be the same size I take it as the one on the west elevation?

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Correct

Mr. Casciani: The other thing was the entrance or the exit flaring that out, you have that on the drawings.

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Correct

Mr. Casciani: Ok, anybody, anything?

Dave Malta: There is going to be a sign there to, isn't there? That says no left turn.

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Correct

Mr. Casciani: The key to that was getting a good size flare on that otherwise INAUDIBLE those things

Josh Artuso: I just have one questions, regarding the small Welcome signs on the building, I see that they are also on the west elevation which I believe is where the cars are going to be coming out of so are they really necessary on that side as well? Because if I read them, I think it is like a Welcome sign.

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Gotcha. That is a good question. (not using the mic) I can confirm that

Josh Artuso: I mean I don't have an issue and I don't know if the board does, but I am just wondering if they are really necessary on the side of the building that cars will be leaving from.

Dave Malta: Doesn't seem to make any sense.

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Yes, I can confirm that with the architect. It might be a carry over sometimes the building based on the site mirrors so maybe it got carried over .

Mark Giardina: There are 2 on the east elevation. There are 2 welcome signs on the east elevation correct.

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Yes

Mark Giardina: And then you have 3 on the west

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Correct

Mark Giardina: I think that is what is being discussed.

Mr. Casciani: So that is the exit on the west elevation. I see what you are saying, why do you need them there.

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Yes, we can confirm that and clean that up.

Mr. Casciani: Back to that curb cut on Ridge Road, I am looking at it and you have it flared out pretty good but the center island is quite small so if somebody wanted to make a turn it looks like it is pretty simple.

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Yes, we did check the geometry of that and that is following DOT standards . We could ask DOT if we can widen the entrance which would widen the island.

Mr. Casciani: I don't care about widening so much as making the center island bigger, so the egress and ingress is smaller . You know what I am saying if you look at the drawing.

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Yes, (not using mic) it looks like we have the room to do it

Mr. Casciani: It looks like an awful big ingress and egress. You see it? So, if the center island there is larger, that would make it a little more difficult because this way here you can still make a turn quite easily.

Caryn Mlodzianowski: We added striping so maybe what we can do is make that an island instead

Mr. Casciani: In the center

Caryn Mlodzianowski: To make the island longer

Mr. Casciani: What you are showing is striping?

Caryn Mlodzianowski: What we show is the island and then the INAUDIBLE (parties both talking)

Mr. Casciani: That really should have

Caryn Mlodzianowski: But we can make it all an island

Mr. Casciani: What you really should have is an island and raise it . You could have multiple curves on it or something, as far as plowing and stuff but then a sign there to. You know, no entrance or whatever.

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Right. We do have the curb proposed and the sign as well.

Mr. Casciani: I seen a dot there, but I couldn't see it. I see what you have, alright. Alright, your lights we discussed that, and everything was good with that . Now, what do you propose. I know they have all their oil picked up and I think Derek brought all this up last time. No outdoor storage

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Correct

Mr. Casciani: No outdoor storage

Caryn Mlodzianowski: Correct

Mr. Casciani: That is where stuff gets away especially here, its right in the open. Ok, we did close the public hearing at the last meeting, so this is here just for final approval so. Anybody have any questions or concerns?

Derek Anderson: There is only one thing that we should comment on from the counties project review letter.

Mr. Casciani: The counties?

Derek Anderson: Yes, and most of it is all technical things but one of them though from DOT, they are asking for a traffic impact study and it says "may be" required INAUDIBLE (parties talking at the same time) and we discussed this at the last meeting and really came to the conclusion while they would like to see it the high traffic business that it actually isn't and the time frame between when a car pulls in, get it's oil changed and moves out, it's what 10-15 minutes I think they said. It's a comment that they had on there and I just think we should reiterate that we talked about this before and that it doesn't seem appropriate .

Mr. Casciani: Josh and I were talking about that today, that's a good point. What we can do is do the approval and make it subject to the Department of Planning for the County acceptable to the Engineering Department because they will have to address the questions that they have asked but we don't need the hold you up for that, it is minor stuff. This way we can still give them their approval and they can address that.

Raja Sekharan: That is fine and to tag along with Derek's though pattern, if you didn't address the quantity of signs at preliminary then you need to put in the approval how many signs you are approving tonight so it is clear for the record so if they come in sometime later for more signage, it's a variance, its something deviated from what was approved.

Mr. Casciani: Actually ,we should put where we are suggesting them to be on the upper north elevation. Ok, I think we are good. Anybody have any questions? We don't need to d SEQR, somebody want to make a motion?

**RESOLUTION 21-064**

Mr. Malta made a motion to **FINAL APPROVAL TO JIFFY LUBE:** Located at 1161 & 1171, Ridge Road & 974 Jackson Road. Applicant Bohler Engineering associated with the construction of a 3,000 SF Jiffy Lube auto care facility 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 which was seconded by Mr. Malta.

VOTE:

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

**CONDITIONS:**

1. Subject to PRC comments.
2. A Letter of Credit to the Town for the project shall include the fee for the Engineer's final certification inspection of the site.
3. Subject to Monroe County Water Authority
4. All the improvements shall be constructed according to the specification of the Town of Webster.
5. Subject to Preliminary Approval Conditions.
6. Subject to all applicable governmental fees.
7. Subject to Department of Public Works approval
8. Significant construction shall occur within one year, as deemed by the Planning Board, to expire on 6.15.22.
9. The conditions of Preliminary and Final approval are depicted on the cover page of the final designed plans.
10. 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.
11. A Letter of Credit to the Town for the project shall include the fee for the Engineer's final certification inspection of the site.
12. All storm water facilities are to be constructed first
13. All downspouts to be connected to the storm sewer system.
14. Subject to resolution of the final approved minutes.

Mr. Casciani: You can put down that the board is approving a sign on the north elevation, upper façade area and the one on the west elevation, so a total of 2 signs.

Dave Malta: And a monument sign.

John Kosel: And the north side should be centered

Mr. Casciani: No outside storage for the site

Raja Sekharan: The signs as proposed on the façade are, they as proposed?

Mr. Casciani: Yes

**RESOLUTION 21-063**

Mr. Anderson made a motion for **SUBDIVISION APPROVAL FOR COMBINING PARCELS:** having SBL #'s 080.13-2-1, 080.13-2-2, 080.13-2-3.1, & 080.13-2-52 into 2 parcels and that the final subdivision map be filed with Monroe County Clerks Office for Final Subdivision application prepared by a licensed Surveyor or Engineer Located at 1161 & 1171, Ridge Road & 974 Jackson Road. located in an MC Medium Intensity Commercial District under Section 228-4 of the Code of the Town of Webster which was seconded by Mr. Malta

**VOTE:**

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

With no other applications before the Board this evening Mr. Casciani concluded tonight's meeting at 7:30 pm.

**ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER:** Minutes were approved for April 20, 2021; May 4, 2021; and May 18, 2021.

Respectfully Submitted,

Signed David C. Arena Sec. Dated 7/6/2021

David C. Arena, Secretary  
Katherine Kolich, Recording Secretary

*Dorothy M. Maguire*  
JUL 7 21 AM 11:12  
FILED WEBSTER TOWN CLK