

TOWN OF CLARKSON
PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

March 17, 2009

PRESENT:

**excused

Board Members

Don Osborne - Chairman
John Jackson **
Scott Hanko
Dave Virgilio
Tom Schrage

Support Board Members

Richard Olson, Town Attorney
John Paul Schepp, Town Engineer
Chad Fabry, Building Inspector
Brian Lemon, Conservation Board
Ursula Liotta, Building Department Coordinator

CALL TO ORDER

D. Osborne called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. He led all present in the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of reflection for the men and women in the military. Further, he reviewed the agenda and asked that cell telephones be silenced.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

1. New Beginnings Christian Fellowship / Former Apple Tree Property – PBA #2009-3

Site Plan Approval – Redevelopment/Change in Use
7397 Ridge Road, Tax Acct. #070.01-1-23.2

Kris Schultz from Schultz & Associates, presented the Applicant's proposal. He mentioned that the majority of the Church Board was present, as well as other members of the congregation; that the members have expressed a great deal of interest in the project. K. Schultz stated the following:

- that the location had been on the market for a long time before it was purchased by the church;
- that the Planning Board application is for site plan approval and change in use;
- that the Attorney for the Town, Richard Olson, has researched the code and per his letter to the Planning Board dated 3/17/09, he stated that the Town Code and Federal Law, in his opinion, "allows for the proposed use for the church as a permitted use and (is) not subject to a special permit." Further, that "this proposal is subject to a site plan review for change of use in accordance with Clarkson Code Section 140.36A."
- that the proposed plan will happen over a period of time;
- that the plans reviewed at this time are interim plans;
- that the largest obstacle is the sewer system and he explained the options;
- that he has talked to the neighbors to inquire if they would be interested in connecting to a proposed sewer system, and inquired whether they would be interested in granting an easement now or in the future, and/or being part of a sanitary sewer district;
- that the proposed sewer system would allow for 50-80 homes to hook into the system, and it would make sense for future development;
- that he does not wish to create a temporary fix to the existing leach system, but rather would rather install a line that would be useful to the church while they are renovating the structure.

Further, K. Schultz explained the parking design for present and future use; that any additional parking would be added at the rear of the building; that at present, the Applicant is looking for site plan approval; that K. Schultz is addressing the sanitation plan immediately so that the Applicant may start the renovation work.

JP Schepp stated that the K. Schultz needs to finalize the routing of the sanitary sewers; that David Goodwin, Highway Superintendent, needs to be involved because the Town would take possession of the main line; that K. Schultz needs to provide the capacity calculations.

S. Hanko inquired regarding easements. K. Schultz stated that contact has been made with the attorneys for the McCagg Estate, and the Mattison families, who border the Applicant's property; and the possible sewer system scenario was explained.

D. Osborne asked regarding the size of the easement. K. Schultz stated that it would be twenty (20) feet wide, but not very deep; that the sewer system is new technology and would be installed just below the frost line.

Additional comments and discussion included: that sprinklers are another engineering issue; that due to the change in use at the site, the water supply needs to be reviewed; that the present lateral line would not be sufficient.

K. Schultz stated that as discussed at the DRC meeting, sprinklers may not be needed because of how the building is partitioned, but if required, it would be very easy to install at this time.

C. Fabry stated that it probably would need to be sprinkled because of the way the building was built, i.e. in sections; that technically, it needs sprinklers due the size and the type of building.

A member of the public inquired regarding the criteria for the sprinkler system. C. Fabry stated that based on NYS Code, the church is not required to have a sprinkler system, however, based on the type of use, the square footage (>6,000 sq. ft.), the style, etc., it is appropriate.

March 17, 2009

TOWN OF CLARKSON
PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

Further, C. Fabry added:

- that the sprinkler system would likely pay for itself in reduced insurance premiums;
- that maximum occupancy is based on a rule of maximum square footage per person, and based on sheer square footage, the whole building needs to be compliant;
- that if the church can prove that a sprinkler system is not needed, he would welcome the information, but he feels it would be prudent for the church to install sprinklers and save money elsewhere in the renovation process.

RESOLUTION ADOPTING NEGATIVE DECLARATION

070.01-1-23.2	7397 W. Ridge Road
Tax Account Number	Address of Property
New Beginnings Christian Fellowship	(same)
Name of Applicant	Name of Project

WHEREAS, the Applicant requests Site Plan Approval – Change of Use, at 7397 W. Ridge Road, Town of Clarkson, County of Monroe, State of New York.

WHEREAS, this Board, by motion dated March 17, 2009 declared itself to be the Lead Agency for Purposes of SEQRA; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with law and local practice, this Board referred this matter to the, the Town Conservation Board; and

WHEREAS, this project is an Unlisted Action for the purposes of SEQRA; and

WHEREAS, the developer has prepared and submitted Part 1 "Project Information" of the (long) Environmental Assessment Form; and

WHEREAS, the Conservation Board has reviewed the documents submitted and recommended a negative declaration be issued; and

WHEREAS, this Board having thoroughly reviewed the Environmental Assessment Form, the Recommendation from the Conservation Board, the conceptual site plan dated March 3, 2009 prepared by Schultz Associates, and all of the items in the application, and having considered each an every impact in accordance with SEQRA

NOW, upon consideration of the above and all of the previous documents, discussion and debate, upon the motion of Donald F. Osborne, seconded by David Virgilio,

BE IT RESOLVED

1. That the Planning Board hereby adopts the Negative Declaration attached hereto and made a part hereof as if the same were set forth a length herein.
2. That this resolution shall take effect immediately. Upon a roll call vote, the votes were cast as follows:

Aye: S. Hanko; J. Jackson; D. Osborne; T. Schrage; D. Virgilio
Planning Board Members of the Town of Clarkson, Monroe County, New York

Whereupon the resolution was declared adopted.

D. Osborne stated that the Conservation Board has reviewed SEQR, and recommended a negative declaration. D. Osborne, on behalf of the Planning Board as Lead Agency, made a motion to accept the negative declaration. D. Virgilio second the motion; unanimously carried. The EAF Determination is attached hereto. The Public Hearing will be scheduled for April 7, 2009.

TOWN OF CLARKSON
PLANNING BOARD - MINUTES

617.20
Appendix A
State Environmental Quality Review
FULL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

Purpose: The full EAF is designed to help applicants and agencies determine, in an orderly manner, whether a project or action may be significant. The question of whether an action may be significant is not always easy to answer. Frequently, there are aspects of a project that are subjective or unmeasurable. It is also understood that those who determine significance may have little or no formal knowledge of the environment or may not be technically expert in environmental analysis. In addition, many who have knowledge in one particular area may not be aware of the broader concerns affecting the question of significance.

The full EAF is intended to provide a method whereby applicants and agencies can be assured that the determination process has been orderly, comprehensive in nature, yet flexible enough to allow introduction of information to fit a project or action.

Full EAF Components: The full EAF is comprised of three parts:

- Part 1:** Provides objective data and information about a given project and its site. By identifying basic project data, it assists a reviewer in the analysis that takes place in Parts 2 and 3.
- Part 2:** Focuses on identifying the range of possible impacts that may occur from a project or action. It provides guidance as to whether an impact is likely to be considered small to moderate or whether it is a potentially large impact. The form also identifies whether an impact can be mitigated or reduced.
- Part 3:** If any impact in Part 2 is identified as potentially-large, then Part 3 is used to evaluate whether or not the impact is actually important.

DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE — Type 1 and Unlisted Actions

Identify the Portions of EAF completed for this project: Part 1 Part 2 Part 3

Upon review of the information recorded on this EAF (Parts 1 and 2 and 3 if appropriate), and any other supporting information, and considering both the magnitude and importance of each impact, it is reasonably determined by the lead agency that:

- A. The project will not result in any large and important impact(s) and, therefore, is one which will **not** have a significant impact on the environment, therefore a **negative declaration will be prepared.**
- B. Although the project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect for this Unlisted Action because the mitigation measures described in PART 3 have been required; therefore a **CONDITIONED negative declaration will be prepared.***
- C. The project may result in one or more large and important impacts that may have a significant impact on the environment, therefore a **positive declaration will be prepared.**

*A Conditioned Negative Declaration is only valid for Unlisted Actions

New Beginnings Christian Fellowship
Name of Action

Town of Clarkson Planning Board
Name of Lead Agency

Donald F. Osborne
Print or Type Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency

Chair, Planning Board
Title of Responsible Officer

Donald F. Osborne
Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency

Brian Lemon
Signature of Preparer (if different from responsible officer)

Donald F. Osborne
Date

17-March-09
Date

Brian Lemon, Chair
Date

3/16/09
Date

K. Schultz inquired if the church could make application to the building department. C. Fabry stated that he needs to see a plan, and that it needs to include a locked seating system.

OPEN FORUM: None

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES from March 3, 2009

D. Osborne made a motion to approve the minutes; second by T. Schrage; unanimously carried.

NEXT MEETING: April 7, 2009 at 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT:

D. Osborn made a motion to adjourn at 7:30 p.m.; second by D. Virgilio; unanimously carried.

Approved 4/7/09

Respectfully submitted,
Ursula M. Liotta, Bldg. Dept. Coordinator