

TOWN OF GATES  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
January 22, 2018

The regular meeting of the Gates Planning Board was called to order at 7:35 PM by Chairman Wall.

PRESENT MEMBERS: M. Wall, Chairman; T. May, D. Chamberlain, J. Argenta, Juan Ruiz (non-voting tonight) Daniel Schum, Town Attorney; K. Rappazzo, Dir. Of Public Works; L. Sinsebox, Town Engineer; Lee Cordero, Councilman

ABSENT MEMBERS: G. Lillie

The first matter on the agenda was approval of the November 27, 2017 Planning Board Minutes.

Ms. May made a motion to approve the minutes as received. Mr. Argenta seconded the motion. All were in favor; the motion carried.

**ROCHESTER TECH PARK- East Parking Lot Expansion      PRELIMINARY/FINAL SITE APPROVAL**  
**OWNER: Peter Chapman      G.I.**  
**LOCATION: 789 Elmgrove Road, Bld. 1**  
**ENGINEER: APD Engineering & Architecture, PLLC**

Mr. Jon Daniels of ADP Engineering was representing this project. Also with him were Christopher Kamar of ADP Engineering and Peter Chapman from Rochester Tech Park.

Mr. Daniels went on to say that this project is a parking lot expansion to the east of Bldg. 5 in Rochester Tech Park consisting of the addition of about 700 parking spaces. There will be some minor grading work involved, stormwater, handicap striping, parking lot lighting, etc. New tenants will be moving into Tech Park and this parking lot expansion is to accommodate the greater number of employees that will be there day to day.

Mr. Daniels stated that they received last week comments from Costich Engineering and have been able to address those comments. They have sent over the response letter and handed out copies of the letter to board members. They were able to address all comments that were provided.

Ms. May asked who will be maintaining the parking lot regarding pot holes, etc.

Mr. Peter Chapman stated that it will be maintained by the Tech Park owner.

Mr. Argenta asked on the east side of Laser Road there is faded out striping. He asked if it was to remain.

Mr. Daniels said that it is to remain.

Ms. May wanted clarification on where snow would be piled up in the lot.

Mr. Chapman stated that they would be pushing the snow towards Elmgrove Road to the east.

Mr. Chamberlain asked what the earthwork balance is on the property. He said that they are going to have to strip a lot of topsoil out of there.

Mr. Daniels stated that they have done calculations and it is very close to even. Not bringing any fill in.

Mr. Argenta asked about the retention pond.

Mr. Daniels stated that that was one of the responses to the comments from Costich Engineering. They will be reconfiguring the pond a bit to bring it out of the easement. It still has the same capacity and the same volume. So it did not affect any of the numbers.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that they will have to apply for another SPDES. There was question that they had one for another project from 2007.

Mr. Daniels stated that they didn't need one after all. They will apply for a new permit.

Mr. Chamberlain asked about the lighting plan. He stated that they did not show what the spillage is if any. They show the location.

Mr. Daniels stated that they did require photometrics for the lights that are proposed. All the fixtures are dark sky compliant.

Mr. Chamberlain asked how high are the poles.

Mr. Daniels stated that they are 29 ft. high.

Ms. May asked for clarification that there is lighting going in. Mr. Daniels stated yes there are light poles in the parking lot.

Mr. Chamberlain said that they are removing 85 trees and shrubs and are increasing with 45 new trees plus a whole number of plantings in the bioretention areas that they have between the parking stalls. One thing he did not see is an actual planting plan. It says a large number of plants going in but no planting plan. No design showing on the plan that he can see. He wanted to know what the spacing is between the species they plan on putting in.

Mr. Daniels stated that they are based on DEC requirements. The warranty on the plants is on the specifications. At least one year. Mr. Chamberlain stated it was 2 years. He stated it says 2 years.

Mr. Chamberlain asked if the owner would have a bond for the plants.

Mr. Sinsebox stated that either a bond or letter of credit covered under storm water.

Mr. Kamar stated that the landscaping has been revised on the plans.

Mr. Chamberlain asked what is inside the landscaping. Mr. Kamar stated that it is earth.

Ms. May asked about handicap parking. How many spots will there be.

Mr. Daniels answered that there will be 20 handicap spots.

Mr. Chamberlain asked why the handicap stalls are narrower than the normal stalls?

Mr. Daniels stated that it is ADA requirements that they only have to be 8 feet.

Mr. Rappazzo stated that they should be 9 ft. He said the spaces need to be redone. He said that the board can give relief to that. ADA only requires 8 ft.

Mr. Schum said that the federal requirements will allow for a greater width for each handicap area than the town code requires. He asked if this plan was sent to Monroe County Planning and wanted to know if they have received a response.

Mr. Daniels said that they have sent to Monroe County Planning but have not received a response as of yet.

Mr. Schum asked if they have submitted a SEQR long form. Mr. Daniels stated that they have.

(Sound system issues, backup tape recorder used)

Mr. Schum asked what the time frame is for the project if they were granted a permit tomorrow.

Mr. Daniels stated about 6-8 months.

Mr. Argenta spoke about islands every so x amount of sq. ft.

Mr. Wall asked Mr. Sinnebox if he recalls.

Mr. Schum stated that code requires that every so often when you have a long linear run of parking spaces that the code requires that there be a break. That would require some relief from the code revision. That relief would come from the Zoning Board not the Planning Board. They do not have the authority.

Mr. Rappazzo stated that the Planning Board can use their discretion to require landscaped islands

Mr. Schum agreed. They can find that this is appropriate for the use.

Mr. Schum stated that some parking spaces will be lost when there is a storm due to snow. Having a break in parking spots would make it worst.

Mr. Chamberlain asked if there was any consideration in having a place for RTS Bus route.

Mr. Daniels stated that they have nothing proposed. He is not sure what the existing stops look like.

Mr. Chapman stated that Bldg. 1 & 2 have stops. The second group is out at Bldg. 9. He stated that they have also purchased a shuttle bus to the front of the building. He said the top of the new parking lot there is a bus stop.

Mr. Wall said that he understands that in the response letter that the lease is signed for the tenant to bring in about 750 employees to the site. They are showing 808 spaces. Is there a chance to landbank some of this parking now and not construct all the asphalt and then when there is the need down the road that the additional parking can be constructed?

Mr. Daniels asked if he meant relocating parking.

Mr. Wall clarified that the said landbanking – for future parking.

Mr. Chapman stated that Bldg. 1 & 5 has approx. 648 parking spaces. They have 3500 employees. Now with Kodak Alaris coming on site they need the spaces.

Mr. Wall asked if the DOT was notified of the project and if they had any traffic concerns. The Town called the DOT and no need for further traffic investigation.

(Sound system issues, backup tape recorder used)

Mr. Wall stated that this is a Type 1 Action listed under SEQR, the town cannot make a decision on the application until it receives a response letter from Monroe County. We need the letter from the county to be made lead agency to go any further with approving this.

Mr. Wall made a motion to TABLE Preliminary/Final Site Approval for Rochester Tech Park – East Parking Lot Expansion application pending the receipt of the following initial items:

1. Since this appears to be a Type 1 Action listed under SEQR, the Town cannot make a decision on the application until it receives a response letter from Monroe County. The letter will provide the Town with the required information to make a SEQR determination. Please provide a copy of the response letter as soon as available.
2. Please depict the snow storage locations on the plan.
3. Please provide earthwork calculations to the Town Engineer and DPW for review.
4. Please provide a photometric plan with foot-candles.
5. Please provide additional landscaping / screening along the frontage of Elmgrove Road.
6. Please address any outstanding / additional comments from the Town Engineer.
7. Please provide Final Plan Set for the Board's review.

There being no further business to come before the Planning Board, Chairman Wall adjourned the meeting at 8:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda M. Saraceni  
Recording Secretary