

CHILI PLANNING BOARD  
May 10, 2016

A meeting of the Chili Planning Board was held on May 10, 2016 at the Chili Town Hall, 3333 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Michael Nyhan.

**PRESENT:** Paul Bloser, David Cross, Matt Emens, John Hellaby, John Nowicki, Ron Richmond and Chairperson Michael Nyhan.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Michael Hanscom, Town Engineering Representative; David Lindsay, Commissioner of Public Works/Superintendent of Highways; Eric Stowe, Assistant Counsel for the Town; Larry Lazenby, Conservation Board Representative.

Chairperson Michael Nyhan declared this to be a legally constituted meeting of the Chili Planning Board. He explained the meeting's procedures and introduced the Board and front table. He announced the fire safety exits.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

1. Application of 221 Golden Road LLC, c/o Ignazio Battisti, owner; 227 Golden Road, Rochester, New York 14624 for recommendation to rezone approximately 63.41 acres from RA-10 (rural agricultural) & R-1-15 (residential) to PRD (Planned Residential Development) with incentive zoning at properties located at 219, 221, 223, 225, 227, 229 Golden Road and 29, 31 Stone Barn Road.

MICHAEL NYHAN: This is postponed at the applicant's request.

**INFORMAL:**

1. Application of Genesee Valley Regional Market, owner; 900 Jefferson Road, Rochester, New York 14623 for revised final site plan approval to erect 5 industrial buildings totaling 80,500 sq. ft. at property located at 1861 Scottsville Road in L.I. & FPO zone.

MICHAEL NYHAN: This application is here for the revised final site plan as a result of the amount of acreage that they will be disturbing. Originally it was 10 acres. Now it will be 12 acres. Therefore, it triggers a Type I action for SEQR. So I would like to declare the -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

DAVID LINDSAY: No. Nothing.

MICHAEL NYHAN: I would like to make a motion to declare the intent of the Zoning [sic] Board to be the lead agency for a coordinated review as a Type I action for the property located at the 1861 Scottsville Road.

JOHN HELLABY: Second.

MATT EMENS: Did you say "Zoning Board"?

MICHAEL NYHAN: I will restate that again. I make a motion for the intent of the Planning Board to be the lead agency for Type I action for coordinated review at property located for this application.

JOHN HELLABY: Second.

The Board was unanimously in favor of the motion.

MICHAEL NYHAN: We'll start the proceeding as a Type I action for this location and the applicant has requested that we table the revised final site plan approval. I make a motion to table the final site plan approval.

Second?

JOHN NOWICKI: Second.

The Board was unanimously in favor of the motion.

**DECISION:** Unanimously tabled by a vote of 7 yes to table the above described application to the June 14, 2016 meeting for the following reason:

1. SEQR requires a long form Environmental Assessment Form. As this is a Type 1 Action, a coordinated review is required.
2. Application of Choice One Development LLC, 126 Ramona Street, Rochester, New York 14613, property owners: Amyell Development Corp. & Press Equities LLC for

preliminary subdivision approval of two lots into three lots to be known as Towers Airport Business Park Phase 2 at properties located at 1200C and 1204B Scottsville Road in G.B. zone.

3. Application of Choice One Development LLC, 126 Ramona Street, Rochester, New York 14613, property owner: Press Equities LLC for special use permit to erect a one story medical building (dialysis center) at property located at 1204B Scottsville Road in G.B. zone.
4. Application of Choice One Development LLC, 126 Ramona Street, Rochester, New York 14613, property owner: Press Equities LLC for preliminary site plan approval to erect a 10,212 sq. ft. one story medical office building at property located at 1204B Scottsville Road in G.B. zone.

JOHN NOWICKI: Mr. Chairman, I need to recuse myself.

MICHAEL NYHAN: Okay. Thank you.

JOHN HELLABY: Do you have an extra one of these? I think there will be questions pertinent to this. If not, I can put this one up there.

Robert Steehler, Dave Baker, Dawn DiMedio and another Labella Associates representative were present to represent the application.

MR. STEEHLER: Hello. I'm Bob Steehler from Labella Associates here with Dave Baker from Choice One Development. I'm here with Dawn DiMedio from Gerard Architects and (indiscernible) from Labella Associates also.

Just to recap our last meeting, April 12th, our informal discussion, we're proposing a new 25-unit dialysis center at 1204B Scottsville Road zoned GB. We're planning on subdividing the 10.6 acre parcel. We're going to take the northeast -- the northwest portion of that parcel, its 2.1 acres and build a new dialysis center.

The building is about 10,200 square feet in size, one story. I don't believe we need any variances. We're meeting all of the Town Code requirements.

Since our April 12th informal discussion, we have also met with the Architectural Advisory Committee. Dawn (DiMedio) met with them today. There were some very minor comments. We'll be submitting record drawings of materials to them. But the overall impression I got is they were in favor of the project.

We also appeared before the Conservation Board on May 2nd and Larry (Lazenby) signed off on the landscaping plan at that meeting.

We have also received Town Engineer comments from Michael Hanscom. Reading through the comments -- we have not had an opportunity to address those comments yet obviously, but it doesn't seem like there is any show-stoppers there. Pretty minor engineering details.

We have also submitted to Monroe County Pure Waters, Monroe County Department of Health and the Monroe County Water Authority and we're currently in process with those agencies.

Aggressive schedule. This project, as I mentioned at the last meeting, looking to start building in June. So we -- so the building is up and running by November.

This is a -- there is an existing facility in Henrietta that's -- can't handle the needs of the client any more, so we're moving that facility to Chili.

So here at this meeting, um, we're applying for a Special Use Permit for the dialysis center. We're applying for SEQR approval. We're applying for preliminary subdivision approval with a waiver for final subdivision approval. It was our intention to submit for preliminary site plan approval and a waiver for final site plan approval. But I'll get into that in a second.

Um, lastly, we received comments from the Monroe County DRC and there was a comment from the Monroe County DOT that a traffic study will be required. Unfortunately, I was not able to contact the DOT today.

We have a very minimal amount of traffic coming from this project. Our maximum, um, usage is going to be about 15 cars an hour. I understand that the Planning Board may not be able to act tonight as a result of the DOT comments, but it is my intention to follow up with them as soon as possible and resolve that.

Any questions from the Board?

MICHAEL NYHAN: Do you want to review the actual plan?

MR. STEEHLER: Sure. So the building is centered on the 2.1 acre parcel, west side of Towers Drive. We're showing parking along the east and west sides with north to the right. We're showing banked parking spaces along the south side if those are ever needed.

Storm sewer will be addressed in a bioretention area in the southeast corner of the property that will discharge to an existing storm sewer on Towers Drive. There will also be a dry swale on the northwest corner of the property to address sheet flow from the north and west sides of the property. Snow storage will be on the outside of the facility, outside the parking lot.

There is an existing Monroe County water main on Towers Drive that we'll be tying into, and there is also an existing 8-inch sanitary Pure Waters main on Towers Drive. So it is our intention not to disturb any areas within the Scottsville Road DOT right-of-way.

Any other questions?

JOHN HELLABY: While you're right up there, it's a little unclear as to how you're splitting this subdivision up. If you could just go over what lots are existing and what you're trying to accomplish with that drawing there.

MR. STEEHLER: Sure. If you flip there, north is to the right. North is up on this page. Existing property is 10.6 acres following my finger here -- weird shaped property. We're taking the west side of Towers Drive and subdividing it out to 2.1 acres with an 8 point -- or 7.3 acre parcel in this area here.

JOHN HELLABY: So the parcel down in with the office building presently on it is presently existing, so that -- the other one is a single lot, sort of a strange shape.

MR. STEEHLER: Correct.

JOHN HELLABY: All right. The lines weren't clear. That is all.

MR. STEEHLER: All right.

JOHN HELLABY: All right.

MICHAEL NYHAN: Will easements be necessary with this subdivision for access?

MR. STEEHLER: Access, ingress egress easement on Towers Drive to handle traffic when coming in and out. Tower Drive will remain part of the private property.

MICHAEL NYHAN: Okay.

MATT EMENS: Number 2, page 2 of Michael Hanscom's letter, the -- I know we talked about this, I think Paul Bloser brought it up last time, correct me if I am wrong, but will you have the required amount of handicapped spots? Was there any consideration on the comments that you received at concept in regards to adding maybe some more ADA spots in the front?

MR. STEEHLER: Yes. We talked about that at the last meeting. Generally these patients are driven to the facility. It's called a nocturnal facility, so they generally don't drive themselves to the facility. That's an easy enough -- you know, we can add handicapped parking spaces. That should be no problem. We have enough parking for the facility. Generally for a facility this size, they only require about 28 parking spaces. So adding a couple extra will not hurt anything. We can certainly do that.

PAUL BLOSER: My comment for that was not so much to have additional for van accessibility but for single car, someone with canes or walkers to access the vehicle, not necessarily a van unloading ramp. Just be taking the standard spot and just make a sign --

MR. STEEHLER: My thought is where we're showing the three existing handicapped spots, we just extend that out and make that whole south side of the parking area handicapped.

PAUL BLOSER: All right.

MATT EMENS: The other thing that I noticed in -- you know, I know that you just brought up the point about the traffic study. You said your amount of cars per hour. One of the things that I was trying to understand, because I see that the engineer's letter also had some comments about stop signs. Um, and it look like both of these are planned to be, um, 24 foot wide -- they're both in and outs; is that correct?

MR. STEEHLER: Yes.

MATT EMENS: Two-way traffic. Sorry. So it just looks like that the one to the north, the closest to Scottsville Road, it is only about 65 or 70 feet from Scottsville Road. I don't know if there are any issues there with, you know -- if other traffic from Tower Drive not necessarily -- doesn't sound like yours will be the issue, but certain times of day it could be difficult to pull out of there and it might get complicated. I don't know if any consideration was given to that.

MR. STEEHLER: You can add a stop sign there and certainly if there is an issue getting out onto Tower Drive from there, people from the dialysis center can use the other exit point. Just generally coming into the site, the way the van accessible area is set up, you kind -- most cars will be entering the north entrance and existing the south entrance as it is. And those roads are designed for a WB-40 truck, delivery truck to be able to utilize coming from Scottsville Road onto that north.

PAUL BLOSER: What size truck?

MR. STEEHLER: WB-40.

PAUL BLOSER: What is the length of that truck?

MR. STEEHLER: I think about 55.

UNIDENTIFIED LABELLA REPRESENTATIVE: Sorry. 50. That would be 50.

MR. STEEHLER: WB-50. So the box on the truck.

PAUL BLOSER: Fresenius delivery truck, I know the driver. I have seen their deliveries and it's a big box.

MR. STEEHLER: Yes.

PAUL BLOSER: It is an extra long, single-axle box.

MATT EMENS: I don't have any other questions or comments.

JOHN HELLABY: You did state that the square footage was 10,200?

MR. STEEHLER: Yep.

JOHN HELLABY: Plus or minus. Somewhere I recall seeing 125 or something to that effect.

MR. STEEHLER: That might have been on initial concept plan.

JOHN HELLABY: I know it's out there, but somewhere in this paperwork I also noticed there was a form on an endangered species thing. I have to ask the question. Do you recall seeing it?

MR. STEEHLER: I don't remember seeing it.

MICHAEL NYHAN: Endangered species?

JOHN HELLABY: There was something there, but I think it pertained hopefully to the --

to the river itself and not this project.

MICHAEL NYHAN: Yes. It was in the environmental report that was done. They identified a zebra muscle that was in the Genesee River and Black Creek that was endangered that will not be affected by your project.

JOHN HELLABY: The light pole that is presently sitting along the edge of the pavement at the banked parking, I know the engineer made a comment of it, but I also questioned the location of that. As I could almost guarantee with the five years, you're going to end up putting that additional parking in there just because of the use these facilities get. Now, you got that pole light sitting right out there in the middle of the parking lot. I just -- you might want to give it some thought as to how you will address that in the future.

MR. STEEHLER: Yes. My thought is I can maybe add a note to the plans that says if the banked parking is built, the light poles will be moved behind the banked parking.

JOHN HELLABY: I don't know if you could center it more and put an island so you wouldn't have to move it, I guess, is the point I'm getting at instead of going through all of the expense. You might give it some thought with no big hang-up.

Snow storage I would assume would be done in the retention pond type area on the end?

MR. STEEHLER: Yes. There is areas for snow storage basically on the entire perimeter of the parking area, about 10 or 20 feet on each side.

JOHN HELLABY: All right. And the last question I have, point of interest, you say this is replacing the Henrietta unit?

MR. STEEHLER: Uh-huh.

JOHN HELLABY: Once this is up and operational, does the Henrietta close, go away?

MR. BAKER: Yes.

JOHN HELLABY: It does. All right.

PAUL BLOSER: That's a leased facility right now. The one in Henrietta.

JOHN HELLABY: Where are they presently located? Do you know? Just out of curiosity.

MR. BAKER: I don't know the exact address.

PAUL BLOSER: It's behind Movies 10, back there.

MICHAEL NYHAN: I noticed on your lighting plan, the parking lot lights and the lighting detail, there were recessed lighting examples and there were building lighting examples. We didn't see that on the plan. Will you have recessed lighting underneath the canopy for drop-off?

MR. STEEHLER: Yes. Some recessed lighting. I think that's the only proposed building lighting; is that correct?

MS. DIMELIO: That's correct.

MR. STEEHLER: The rest of the lighting will be the pole-mounted.

MICHAEL NYHAN: No other building lighting other than for the sign -- no lighting attached to the building itself.

MS. DIMELIO: Except for egress. Required for egress.

MR. STEEHLER: Yes. Except for required for egress.

MATT EMENS: At the man doors.

MICHAEL NYHAN: At the doors?

MR. STEEHLER: Yes.

MICHAEL NYHAN: Okay. Thank you.

DAVID CROSS: I think Matt (Emens) brings up a really good point about that north entrance onto Tower Drive. I think that really should be one way into the facility. It -- it is just too close to Scottsville Road. It's a too far maneuver for cars existing onto Tower and trying to get out Scottsville Road. It is just easy striping. I don't mind the width. I think that's great for emergency access, but certainly a one-way in there.

MR. STEEHLER: We can take a look at that.

DAVID CROSS: Okay. And I brought it up at the last meeting. I think it's like a Phragmites. Maybe I will look to the Conservation Board. All that kind of brown tall weed -- I'm not a horticulturist, but I think that's an invasive species, and the plan shows for maybe some of it to be cleaned up. You're building this beautiful building. I think it fits the site beautifully. Might be nice to just clean that all up and might have to go out in the right-of-way a little bit and get rid of it, but I think it would really make things look much nicer out there.

MR. STEEHLER: I agree with you. My only concern is there is a culvert coming under Scottsville Road and it kind -- it comes out there where you see the cattails. My only concern with that is whether or not it's a -- considered a wetland. I know that you can mow that kind of wetland, so perhaps we just mow it to clean it up.

DAVID CROSS: I -- I -- I don't know if it has to be hand picked or what has to be done, but I would like to see Scottsville Road cleaned up and that would be, um -- I think a nice starting point.

MR. STEEHLER: Definitely. Agreed.

DAVID CROSS: All I have, Mike (Nyhan).

RICHARD STOWE: Just with respect to the order of things, if we're going to do the Public Hearing on all three, close the public hearing on all three, or just to keep the record clear on what your intentions are. My only comment with respect to the application is just easements subject to our review.

MICHAEL NYHAN: Okay.

DAVID LINDSAY: No comment.

MICHAEL HANSCOM: No additional comments.

LARRY LAZENBY: No.

DAVID CROSS: Just feel it's a shame that the DOT wants to hold this up over 15 cars per hour, but it's the way it is.

MICHAEL NYHAN: Understood.

This is for all three applications, Public Hearing for the subdivision, Special Use Permit and the preliminary site plan.

COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE: None.

Michael Nyhan made a motion to close the Public Hearing portions of these applications, and John Hellaby seconded the motion. The Board unanimously approved the motion.

The Public Hearing portions of these applications were closed at this time.

MICHAEL NYHAN: Public Hearing is closed for all three applications.

Based on the report that has been -- before I start with SEQR, are there any other questions beyond that for the Board?

Based on the application and the Environmental Assessment Form that was completed, as well as all of the comments received from Labella, as well as the New York State Department of Environment Conservation, New York State Parks Recreation and Historic Preservation, and the application itself, Michael Nyhan made a motion to declare the Board lead agency as far as SEQR, and based on evidence and information presented at this meeting, determined the application to be an unlisted action with no significant environmental impact, and John Hellaby seconded the motion. The Board all voted yes on the motion.

MICHAEL NYHAN: I will take a vote for each one of the applications separately.

The first one, the preliminary subdivision approval. Are there any conditions other than the approval subject to final approval of the Town Engineer and Commissioner of Public Works? Town Engineer and Commissioner of Public Works shall be given copies of any correspondence with other approving agencies.

Applicant shall comply with all pertinent Monroe County Development Review Committee comments.

And copies of all easements associated with this project shall be provided to the Assistant Town Counsel for approval.

And all filing information: i.e., liber and page number shall be noted on the mylars.

Any other questions for the preliminary subdivision approval? No.

RICHARD STOWE: I think their application included waiver of final subdivision. Just to address that portion of their application.

MICHAEL NYHAN: Yes. It did.

So preliminary subdivision approval with the waiver of final with the conditions read on this application.

DECISION ON APPLICATION #2: Approved by a vote of 6 yes with 1 abstention (John Nowicki) the above described application with the following conditions:

1. Approval is subject to final approval by the Town Engineer and Commissioner of Public Works.
2. The Town Engineer and Commissioner of Public Works shall be given copies of any correspondence with other approving agencies.
3. Applicant shall comply with all pertinent Monroe County Development Review Committee comments.
4. Copies of all easements associated with this project shall be provided to the Assistant Town Counsel for approval, and all filing information (i.e. liber and page number) shall be noted on the mylars.

Note: Final subdivision approval has been waived by the Planning Board.

MICHAEL NYHAN: I don't believe there are any conditions to this. Board have any conditions for Special Use Permit?

DECISION ON APPLICATION #3: Approved by a vote of 6 yes with 1 abstention (John Nowicki) the above described application with no conditions.

MICHAEL NYHAN: For application of the preliminary and waiver of final for the site plan approval to erect a 10,210 square foot building. We do have County Comments that require a traffic study. So for the reasons for the tabling will be other approving agencies' input

necessary for approval not complete.

With that I understand I will accept -- or a request for you to table the application for preliminary site plan approval as well as waiver of final. So from a request, do I have a second for tabling?

JOHN HELLABY: Second.

DECISION ON APPLICATION #4: Unanimously tabled by a vote of 6 yes to table with 1 abstention (John Nowicki) the above described application to the June 14, 2016 meeting for the following reasons:

1. Other approving agencies input necessary for approval not complete.
2. Public hearing for this application has been closed.

INFORMAL:

2. Application of Westside Development LLC, 3313 Chili Avenue, Rochester, New York 14624 for revised final site plan approval for four sports fields (applicant is requesting change in condition of approval for landscaping) at property located at 420 Ballantyne Road in PRD, FPO, FW zone.

Joe Jacobs was present to represent the application.

MICHAEL NYHAN: We did hear this and approved final, but the application initially would provide 1 percent donation to the planting fund. They have revised their site plan and will be using the landscaping on the property. So we're here to hear that revised final plan with your landscaping.

MR. JACOBS: Joe Jacobs with Passero Associates. Matt Sinacola was going to be here but couldn't make it.

We are representing Westside Development.

You guys kind of heard exactly what the Chairman kind of summarized what is going on. We came to the Planning Board. We sought final site plan approval in February. I believe February 9th.

One of the conditions was a 1 percent donation to the Town Landscaping Fund. After the approval, we went back to the applicant, reviewed all of the approvals. Identified some spots on site that could -- that would benefit from additional landscaping. The initial conversation with the Conservation Board was that, you know, because of-- the main portion of the project is soccer fields, the landscaping shouldn't belong near a soccer field or in the back next to the wetlands, because it would just be disappeared -- they just disappear into the background.

So we -- you know, we kind of came up with a couple of ideas and we identified the corridor along Ballantyne Road State Route 252 could benefit from some additional landscaping. We -- it puts -- I will go over here.

I don't know if you guys can see it. So, um, on -- along the southern property line, Ballantyne Road, there is a stand of trees that we placed. There is an approximately 13 trees. Full maturity, they will be 30 to 50 feet, in height.

We went to the Conservation Board May 2nd. They had some comments related to the planting notes in the details, made some changes to the actual species of the trees. They subsequently approved the plan and we are now before you for just the amendment of the initial resolution to kind of bring you up to speed what happened since then. Also one of the comments was the gate on the west entrance of the parking lot, Mr. Lindsay and the DOT had a couple conversations, and they subsequently decided to eliminate that per the DOT. I know that was Mr. Cross' -- one of his concerns. So we have a PERM 33-COM in with the New York State DOT now for the removal of that entrance and additionally repaving approximately 50 feet of the main entrance to bring it up to code basically, bring it up to standard, State standard.

And other than that, besides my creepy moustache, that -- I think that is all that is new. Anybody have any questions?

MATT EMENS: I think you answered all of them, but you have generated a few more.

So you have noted the trees by the road are new. The trees on the roadway back, to the fields, are those also new or were those on the original plans?

MR. JACOBS: These were original plans. These are ornamentals. Smaller. They will flower more. It not be so much for screening, but for beautification.

MATT EMENS: The trees as shown at the road, there were two different varieties, I believe.

MR. JACOBS: Correct.

MATT EMENS: You said they had been revised. Are we looking at the new or has it been --

MR. JACOBS: The new one was sent to the Conservation Board. We have not submitted the actual revised plan, and, Larry (Lazenby), you know -- let me -- there wasn't anything major. They changed the initial planting from maples to Red Sunset and October Glory Red Maple. Just a variety of an actual maple tree.

Then the planting details obviously in the notes were kind of massaged a little bit to -- to

the Conservation Board's liking.

MATT EMENS: The -- I just want to confirm what you originally said. The way you have them shown right now in that site plan, that is really the canopy -- at full maturity, not day one planting, correct?

MR. JACOBS: Correct. We'll obviously install the 2 1/2 inch caliper, but, you know, because it's -- the site is vast and so large, you know, it looks really, really small in that corner, but, you know, you drive around. You drive down -- going westbound, you know, it's a big open area. So, you know, kind of -- you know, providing some sort of a -- an aesthetic, you know -- with those trees, we thought it would be a good spot.

MATT EMENS: If the Conservation Board has reviewed it, then I don't have any other questions or concerns.

JOHN HELLABY: Please make sure that anything you do plant down there does not impede the sight distance in any way, shape or form with the traffic situation there.

MR. JACOBS: Understood. And we'll -- again, we're going through a full DOT application, so that will surely be addressed.

MICHAEL NYHAN: The far west entrance/exit you did have will be removed?

MR. JACOBS: Yep.

MICHAEL NYHAN: I notice there is a chain across where there would be a driveway and there is a bunch of concrete, old junk, I guess, if you will, that has been placed there. Will that all be removed and will the drainage ditch be opened there?

MR. JACOBS: Correct.

MICHAEL NYHAN: What will happen with that so it will look a lot better than what it does now and will be usable?

MR. JACOBS: We'll remove the culvert, daylight that swale, stabilize it per DOT standards. And it will just be regular hydroseeded. After a couple of years, it will be a longer grass, low maintenance mix.

JOHN NOWICKI: Getting rid of the driveway all together, correct?

MR. JACOBS: Yes.

JOHN NOWICKI: The -- did this applicant have to do a traffic study?

MATT EMENS: I'm pretty sure.

MR. JACOBS: Yes.

JOHN NOWICKI: You did a traffic study?

MR. JACOBS: Yes.

MATT EMENS: Because they were talking about the turn-in lanes, remember? Dave's concern was the two entrances with the turning lanes.

JOHN NOWICKI: The turning lanes are in place?

MATT EMENS: I don't think they are. I don't think they're required.

MR. JACOBS: The -- the gist of the traffic study was there is going to be -- for large events, there is going to be traffic generated, but again, it's -- the church -- the church -- that's what John Caruso called it, the church effect. It doesn't warrant a left turn because it's so sporadic, the seasonal weekend games.

Normal traffic, however, will be upwards of like 30, 40 trips generated at the peak hour, which is surely not enough to warrant an actual turning -- like an actual turn lane. And the DOT, I believe, was in the loop with our initial traffic study, too, as well. So they concurred.

JOHN NOWICKI: I hope it works.

PAUL BLOSER: Only comment I will make, what they're asking for here, um -- what I have seen this -- here so far between -- they have redone that miniature golf course kind of thing, put a lot of new vegetation in there. So my question is, is what you're proposing here, is that part of it or are you looking at additional above beyond what they have done with the 18 hole?

MR. JACOBS: Addition.

PAUL BLOSER: Above and beyond that?

MR. JACOBS: Yes. 13 new trees completely separate.

PAUL BLOSER: That looks a whole lot nicer now that that is done. I would rather see something like this coming into the property than -- if he is willing to do it, I would rather see him spend it there and make that look -- it needs dressing.

MICHAEL NYHAN: Agreed. Thank you.

If there are no other additional comments or questions, SEQR was already completed on this, as well as the Public Hearing. What about conditions?

Standard conditions, applicant to comply with the landscaping plan approved by the Conservation Board.

Upon completion of the project, the applicant shall submit a landscape Certificate of Compliance to the Building Department from the landscaping architect certifying that all approved plantings have been furnished and installed in substantial conformance with the approved landscape plan.

Approval is subject to final approval of the Town Engineer and Commissioner of Public Works.

Town Engineer and Commissioner of Public Works shall be given copies of any correspondence with other approving agencies. And all previous conditions imposed by this Board that are still pertinent to the applicant remain in effect.

Any other conditions to include on the subdivision?

RON RICHMOND: Do we need a condition that says close the west entrance?

PAUL BLOSER: It's already been done. The only things on the plantings, let's put a

90-day thing on it as opposed to the end of August.

MICHAEL NYHAN: 90 days to complete the landscaping.

PAUL BLOSER: I don't want to be looking for it in three or four years why it is not done.

MICHAEL NYHAN: When is the project starting?

MR. JACOBS: It will be starting hopefully within -- as soon as the DOT -- you know, at least gives us -- gets in the second approval stage of the DOT. So I'm thinking about a month, month and a half.

MICHAEL NYHAN: When will it be completed?

MR. JACOBS: Hopefully by the end of the construction season.

MICHAEL NYHAN: I'm sorry, by?

MR. JACOBS: By the end of the construction season.

MICHAEL NYHAN: So in the fall time?

MR. JACOBS: Yes. Instead of doing 90-day, maybe just a note about appropriate plantings, you know, plant during the appropriate season? Is that --

PAUL BLOSER: I would like to have it done this season so we're not going into next spring.

MR. JACOBS: Okay.

PAUL BLOSER: If we say the end of September, could you live with that?

MR. JACOBS: I think so, yeah.

PAUL BLOSER: I just like to have a closure date on it.

MICHAEL NYHAN: So for September 30th, 2016? I will add that condition, that the landscaping as depicted on the drawings shall be completed by September 30th, 2016.

Any other conditions of approval?

With that, motion to accept this application for the revised final site plan approval and the revised landscaping on the plan?

JOHN HELLABY: Second.

DECISION: Unanimously approved by a vote of 7 yes the above described application with the following conditions:

1. Landscape as shown on plans shall be complete by September 30, 2016.
2. Applicant to comply with the landscaping plan approved by the Conservation Board.
3. Upon completion of the project, the applicant shall submit a Landscape Certificate of Compliance to the Building Department from the Landscape Architect certifying that all approved plantings have been furnished and installed in substantial conformance with the approved landscape plan.
4. Approval is subject to final approval by the Town Engineer and Commissioner of Public Works.
5. The Town Engineer and Commissioner of Public Works shall be given copies of any correspondence with other approving agencies.
6. All previous conditions imposed by this Board that are still pertinent to the application remain in effect.

MICHAEL NYHAN: I make a motion to accept the Chili Planning Board minutes of April 12th, 2016.

JOHN HELLABY: Second.

The Board was unanimously in favor of the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:41 p.m.