

TOWN OF CLARKSON
PLANNING BOARD – MINUTES

June 19, 2012

Board Members

Don Osborne, Chair
John Jackson
Scott Hanko
Dave Virgilio
Tom Schrage

Support Board Members

Richard Olson, Town Attorney
John Paul Schepp, Town Engineer
Chad Fabry, Building Inspector/CEO
Ursula Liotta, Administrative Assistant
*excused

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. D. Osborne led in the Pledge of Allegiance, asked for a moment of silence for the men and women in the military, and reviewed the agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Henry Conradt**, Clarkson Self-Storage, Applicant – site plan approval
Re: 3599 Lake Rd., Tax ID #054.13-1-2, Zoned HC / HMU

D. Osborne opened the Public Hearing by reading the legal notice and Resolution aloud.

RESOLUTION ADOPTING NEGATIVE DECLARATION

054.13-1-2

Tax Account Number

Henry Conradt

Name of Applicant

3599 Lake Road

Address of Property

Clarkson Self Storage

Name of Project

WHEREAS, the Applicant requests Site Plan Approval at 3599 Lake Road, Town of Clarkson, County of Monroe, State of New York.

WHEREAS, this Board, declared itself to be the Lead Agency for Purposes of SEQRA on June 5, 2012; 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 Full Environmental Assessment Form; and

WHEREAS, the Conservation Board reviewed the submitted documents on June 14, 2012 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 property development plans dated May 22, 2012 prepared by Schultz Associates, and all of the items in the application, and having considered each and 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 D. Osborne, seconded by T. Schrage, and unanimously carried,

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.*

Whereupon the Resolution was declared adopted.

TOWN OF CLARKSON
PLANNING BOARD – MINUTES

June 19, 2012

Re: Contract, 3599 Lake Rd

PART II - IMPACT ASSESSMENT (To be completed by Lead Agency)

A. DOES ACTION EXCEED ANY TYPE THRESHOLD IN 6 NYCRR, PART 617.4? If yes, coordinate the review process and use the FULL EAF.
 Yes No

B. WILL ACTION RECEIVE COORDINATED REVIEW AS PROVIDED FOR UNLISTED ACTIONS IN 6 NYCRR, PART 617.6? If No, a negative declaration may be superseded by another involved agency.
 Yes No

C. COULD ACTION RESULT IN ANY ADVERSE EFFECTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE FOLLOWING? (Answers may be handwritten, if legible)

C1. Existing air quality, surface or groundwater quality or quantity, noise levels, existing traffic pattern, solid waste production or disposal, potential for erosion, drainage or flooding problems? Explain briefly.

C2. Aesthetic, agricultural, archaeological, historic, or other natural or cultural resources, or community or neighborhood character? Explain briefly.

C3. Vegetation or fauna, fish, shellfish or wildlife species, significant habitats, or threatened or endangered species? Explain briefly.

C4. A community's existing plans or goals as officially adopted, or a change in use or intensity of use of land or other natural resources? Explain briefly.

C5. Growth, subsequent development, or related activities likely to be induced by the proposed action? Explain briefly.

C6. Long term, short term, cumulative, or other effects not identified in C1-C5? Explain briefly.

C7. Other impacts (including changes in use of other quantity or type of energy)? Explain briefly.

D. WILL THE PROJECT HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS THAT CAUSED THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL AREA (CEA)? If yes, explain briefly.
 Yes No

E. IS THERE, OR IS THERE LIKELY TO BE, CONTROVERSY RELATED TO POTENTIAL ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS? If yes explain:
 Yes No

PART III - DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE (To be completed by Agency)

INSTRUCTIONS: For each adverse effect identified above, determine whether it is substantial, large, important or otherwise significant. Each effect should be assessed in connection with its (a) setting (i.e. urban or rural); (b) probability of occurring; (c) duration; (d) irreversibility; (e) geographic scope; and (f) magnitude. If necessary, add attachments or reference supporting materials. Ensure that explanations contain sufficient detail to show that all relevant adverse impacts have been identified and adequately addressed. If question d of part II was checked yes, the determination of significance must evaluate the potential impact of the proposed action on the environmental characteristics of the CEA.

Check this box if you have identified one or more potentially large or significant adverse impacts which MAY occur. Then proceed directly to the FULL EAF and/or prepare a positive declaration.

Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action WILL NOT result in any significant adverse environmental impacts AND provide, on attachments as necessary, the reasons supporting this determination.

Town of Clarkson Planning Board 6/19/12
Name of Lead Agency Date

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

Chairman
Title of Responsible Officer

Donald F. Osborne 6/19/12
Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency Signature of Preparer (if different from responsible officer) Date

Brian Lemon, Chairman
Conservation Board

The Applicant was asked to briefly explain the application. David Matt, of Schultz Associates, and on behalf of the Applicant, explained that he amended the 1990 approved site plan which included 4 buildings, to a new site plan with 6 buildings; that the Applicant has applied to the ZBA for an area variance for two of the buildings on the new site plan since they did not meet the current zoning code setbacks, and the Public Hearing on that matter is scheduled for June 20, 2012.

D. Osborne asked for comments from the public.

Glenn Bianchi, representing Jubilee Christian Church, 3565 Lake Road, stated that the church had no issue with the proposed site plan, but questioned the height of the future building to the front, i.e. 1 or 2 stories; whether it will line up with the other buildings in the neighborhood; will it block the view to the church. The Applicant stated that he is not sure about the plans for that building yet but will take those concerns into consideration. The Applicant further stated that he is avoiding fencing the property in order to keep the property open and clean-looking.

R. Olson mentioned two errors on the site plan's notes that the engineer will correct. D. Virgilio made a motion to close the Public Hearing; second by T. Schrage; unanimously carried.

TOWN OF CLARKSON
PLANNING BOARD – MINUTES

June 19, 2012

Further board discussion included: Zastrow Drive is a dedicated road per D. Goodwin, Highway Superintendent; the storage buildings will be single story, and have flat roofs w/curved edges; lighting will be on the front and sides of the buildings; nothing is to be stored externally on site; it will have a stone driveway, to be paved within 1 year; the fire access lanes need to be reviewed by D. Matt and C. Fabry, and adjustments made to the site plan.

D. Osborne made a motion that the Public Hearing be continued on July 3, 2010, pending the receipt of the referral from Monroe County, the ZBA decision, and updates to the Mylar; second by T. Schrage; unanimously carried.

2. **Joseph Scarfone**, Atlas Automation, Applicant – site plan approval
Re: 77 Clarkridge Dr. (Lot 6), Tax ID #055.04-1-17.115, Zoned GI / I

D. Osborne opened the Public Hearing by reading the legal notice and Resolution aloud.

RESOLUTION ADOPTING NEGATIVE DECLARATION

055.04-1-17.115 & 055.04-1-17.114

Tax Account Number

Joseph Scarfone

Name of Applicant

77 & 99 Clarkridge Drive

Address of Property

Atlas Automation

Name of Project

WHEREAS, the Applicant requests Site Plan Approval at 77 & 99 Clarkridge Drive, Town of Clarkson, County of Monroe, State of New York.

WHEREAS, this Board, declared itself to be the Lead Agency for Purposes of SEQRA on June 5, 2012; 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 Full Environmental Assessment Form; and

WHEREAS, the Conservation Board reviewed the submitted documents on June 14, 2012 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 property development plans dated April, 2012 and prepared by McMahon LaRue Associates, and all of the items in the application, and having considered each and 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 D. Osborne, seconded by T. Schrage, and unanimously carried,

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.*

Whereupon the Resolution was declared adopted.

TOWN OF CLARKSON
PLANNING BOARD – MINUTES

June 19, 2012

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.

THIS AREA FOR LEAD AGENCY USE ONLY

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

Atlas Automation

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

Chairman Planning Board

Title of Responsible Officer

Donald F. Osborne

Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency

Conservation Board

Signature of Preparer (if different from responsible officer)

Brian Lemon, Chairman

Date 6/14/12

6/19/12

Date

website

Page 1 of 21

The Applicant or representative was asked to briefly explain the application. David Waldarek, architect and Greg McMahon, engineer were present with the Applicant. D. Waldarek explained that the proposed site plan includes an office building of <12,000 sq. ft., and showed the colors and products to be used on the exterior; he also reviewed the floor plan that will house the engineering, marketing, and administration portion of the business.

G. McMahon presented the site plan, showing the existing building on Lot 5, the new building on Lot 6, and the retention pond on Lot 8.

D. Osborne asked for comments from the public.

Don Ciccone, 4025 Clarkson Parma Town Line Road, questioned whether the entrance to the site will only be from Ridge Road onto Clarkridge Drive. Yes.

The Board is in receipt of the Monroe County's response to the referral, and all comments had been addressed by G. McMahon. JP Schepp stated that all of his engineering concerns have also been met. R. Olson reminded the engineer that the easement from Lot 6 to Lot 8 is required prior to the Mylar being signed.

D. Osborne made a motion to close the Public Hearing; second by T. Schrage; unanimously carried. S. Hanko made a motion to grant site plan approval. Second by J. Jackson; unanimously carried.

TOWN OF CLARKSON
PLANNING BOARD – MINUTES

June 19, 2012

NEW BUSINESS

3. **Chad Smith**, Applicant – site plan approval
4.8 a. parcel @ 3501 Ridge Road, Tax ID #039.03-1-13, Zoned HC / C

D. Matt, of Schultz Associates, on behalf of the Applicant, stated that he was presenting a three phase (10 yr.) site plan.

- In **Phase 1**, the Applicant would build a 40'x60' barn to store the lawn equipment for his business, with parking for 6 employees; the driveway access would be off of Redman Road.
- **Phase 2** includes the addition of a restroom, leach field, and 13 additional customer parking spaces.
- **Phase 3** includes the addition of 16 customer parking spaces, additional outdoor plant storage, and an additional 40'x60' barn.
- The site plan includes screening to create a buffer to the residential property to the North. JP Schepp asked that the sizing and the species be noted on the site plan.
- The site plan includes security lighting for the barn in Phase 1. JP Schepp asked that the lighting for all phases be added to the site plan.
- The driveway has sloping issues. Monroe County DOT will have jurisdiction over the slope site and will probably have comments in their response to the referral. The Applicant agreed that it needs to be flattened out in order to get his work vehicles out safely each work day.
- The paved driveway and parking areas are to be considered as the plan is phased, including ingress/egress for pedestrians/customers. It was noted that Evergreen Landscaping is not paved. There will not be a lot of vehicle traffic until Phase 2.
- The site plan is on the fringe of one acre disturbance. JP Schepp will work with D. Matt to determine the reasonable disturbance area.

The Board agreed to schedule a Public Hearing on July 3, 2012.

OTHER

4. **Pure Airsoft** – rezoning of 3574 Sweden Walker Road
Review Comprehensive Plan; make recommendation to Town Board; PH set for 7-9-12

The Board discussed the rezoning application proposing a change from **RS-20** to **Recreation Conservation**, and reviewed the current code for each district. It was agreed that this Board likes the Applicant's proposed business, but not at the site in question. R. Olson will draft a letter from this Board to the Town Board prior to the July 10, 2012 Public Hearing.

5. **Brockport Federal Credit Union** – review letter recd. from MCDOT

The Board reviewed the letter received from MCDOT dated June 15, 2012. D. Osborne made a motion to accept the letter which states that the road shoulder work is not needed at the present time, and to remove any prior restrictions that the Planning Board may have placed on the developer. Second by T. Schrage; unanimously carried.

REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES: June 5, 2012

D. Osborne made a motion to approve the minutes; second by J. Jackson; unanimously carried.

NEXT MEETING: July 3, 2012 (Note: J. Jackson & S. Hanko are unavailable on 7-17-12)

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Approved 7-3-12

Respectfully submitted,

Ursula M. Liotta
Administrative Assistant