

**Regular meeting of the Village of Brockport Planning Board was held in the Conference Room, Municipal Building, 49 State Street, Brockport, New York, Monday, March 11, 2013 at 7:00pm.**

**PRESENT:** Chair Charles Switzer, Member Arthur Appleby, Member Annette Locke, Member Bernard Daily, Building/Zoning Officer Scott C. Zarnstorff, Clerk Pamela W. Krahe

**ALSO PRESENT:** JP Schepp (Chatfield Engineers), Jose Mendez, Joan Hamlin

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Switzer called the meeting to order and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**REVIEW OF MEETING MINUTES:** Chair Switzer called for a motion to approve the minutes of the previous meeting.

➔ Member Locke moved, Member Appleby seconded, unanimously carried to approve the minutes of December 10, 2012 as written.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:** None

**BUSINESS:**

1. Application of:	Name:	Jose Mendez
	Address:	22 North Main Street
	Tax Map #:	069.45-1-1
	Zoning:	B-Business
	Parcel Size:	1.7 acres
	Prop. Class:	465
	Purpose:	Construction of a 56'x100' office building

**Presentation/discussion:**

Mr. Mendez said he still has the same plans for the building/site and would like to move forward. His architect, Mr. Strabel, couldn't be here tonight so Mr. Mendez offered to answer questions as best he can. The March 4, 2013 letter from Chatfield Engineers was discussed. The letter has already been sent to Mr. Strabel and emailed to Jim Glogowski, the applicant's engineer. Chair Switzer read the following comments from the letter:

1. Complete drainage calculations showing the pre and post-construction runoff need to be provided. The increased site runoff will need to be controlled with a stormwater management facility. The proposed "STC Interceptor Manhole" may provide water quality improvement, but does not address the additional runoff.
2. Section 27-10 of the Brockport Village Code requires the preparation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), where greater than 25,000 square feet of ground disturbance will occur. Based upon my review, this project will exceed the threshold and a SWPPP is required.
3. Details of the proposed pavement sections, sidewalks, and curbs should be provided.
4. Approval will be required from the NYSDOT for the connections of the water, sewer and storm drains.
5. Details of the ramps should be provided. It is unclear where the ADA accessible ramps, curbs and handrails are located. The ramps slopes are not clear.
6. The Plans should have a table indicating the following: zoning, setback requirements, acreage, building size, green space, parking space requirements per Section 58-22 of the Village Code, etc.
7. The plans should indicate the location of the utilities serving the existing building.
8. A guiderail should be considered at the north end of the rear parking lot and adjacent to other steep slopes. The slope to the north drops about 7 feet vertically over 16 feet.
9. The Plans should include a photometric plan of the site lighting.
10. The planning board should consider whether landscaping improvements are required.
11. The rear parking area should have a 24-foot wide access lane to allow back out from the parking spaces.
12. Parking and access aisles for the existing facility should be shown on the plans to verify that the ingress and egress is satisfactory and to determine if the required number of spaces are provided.
13. The plans show the removal of the existing curbs north of the existing building, but the grading plan shows no grading changes.

## MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF March 11, 2013

Mr. Mendez said he has not been in recent contact with Mr. Glogowski, but he understands the engineer needs to answer the questions raised. Mr. Strabel had suggested waiting to draw detailed plans until Mr. Mendez receives Board approval. The Board reminded Mr. Mendez that they did indeed give concept approval when they met with Mr. Mendez in May 2012.

Discussion centered around some of the drainage concerns brought up at the May 2012 meeting. The applicant stated his engineer inquired with the State DOT about moving the runoff westerly, but the DOT denied the request. The neighboring Villager Apartments complex has stormwater drainage that runs northerly, across Liberty Street and to the creek. The current piping is too small and needs to be replaced as flooding has been an issue. CEO Zarnstorff indicated the village will replace that system and Chatfield has done drawings. If Mr. Mendez proceeds with his proposal and wishes to add his stormwater to the system, the village will ask him to contribute to the cost. The village has talked with management from Villager Apartments and they are agreeable to contributing toward the cost because it will improve their drainage. Agreements need to be drawn up between all parties. CEO Zarnstorff called the plan a win-win, but noted there are details to work out such as easements for cross-access. CEO Zarnstorff suggested Mr. Mendez contact Villager Apartments; Mr. Mendez concurred.

The applicant asked about a retention pond. Village Engineer Schepp said the project is right on the fringe of the 25,000sf of total disturbance which triggers additional requirements for stormwater runoff. Mr. Mendez indicated there are two plans and if they build the smaller 5000 square foot building, the roof will be smaller and there will be less parking area. VE Schepp opined the state will probably not let the project proceed as drawn by Mr. Glogowski, as there are capacity issues. The engineer pointed out some of the details from the drawing to Mr. Mendez. They discussed the option of a pond that drains into the Villager Apartments system, then to Liberty Street. If Mr. Mendez chooses not to contribute to the newly proposed drainage system upgrade, then he will probably need a detention pond for the runoff.

Mr. Mendez voiced that one of the benefits of new construction is to be able to build the way he wants, so the building will be nice. The Board noted they will want to review materials, lighting, etc.

Member Appleby questioned where the entrance will be. The curb cut is the same as was shown before. Mr. Mendez pointed it out.

Member Locke asked what the floor plan might be. Dr Raf (the optician) will take one portion with a tanning salon in the other. There will still be two office suites in the older building and then two in the new building. They would like the exterior of the new structure to be comparable to the existing building. Member Appleby asked if Mr. Mendez if he feels comfortable with what would be his portion of the cost of the stormwater contribution; Mr. Mendez affirmed.

Some discussion followed of the May meeting and the positioning of the building so it comes right up to the existing pavement.

CEO Zarnstorff pointed out that he advised Mr. Strabel to obtain an audience with the village Tree Board to discuss existing vegetation and details of what will be added. Village Code was recently amended, stating new development needs to come before the Tree Board.

CEO Zarnstorff also brought up that before we get too far on the drawings, it might be prudent to discuss numbering the new building. The number 24 is available, as the existing building is 22 and the former dry cleaner building, where "Body by Summer" currently rents, is number 26. He will double check on the numbering and let Mr. Strabel know.

Chair Switzer asked if this is an unlisted action under SEQR; Zarnstorff affirmed. CEO Zarnstorff added that because it is unlisted, this board is automatically the lead agency. He advised not moving forward with SEQR until stormwater details are more complete. A County referral will be necessary when the plans are more complete.

Mr. Mendez recapped that Mr. Glogowski needs to address the issues brought up by the village engineer; CEO Zarnstorff affirmed and indicated that preliminary site plan approval would probably happen at the next meeting. If there are any unanswered details left, there could be a third meeting to finalize them. The Board reiterated they agree with the concept, they just need details now.

### OTHER BUSINESS:

- Member Appleby mentioned the Town of Pittsford's website offers Planning Board forms and guidelines. He suggests the VOB Planning Board lead a discussion of what we could similarly offer to assist a new developer through the process. CEO Zarnstorff concurred, mentioning that he previously brought up this idea. He suggested guidelines, forms, and a checklist that walks an applicant through the process. He thought it a good project that the Board could work on collectively. Chair Switzer asked Member Appleby to bring some suggestions to the next meeting.
- Chair Switzer remarked that he and Mayor Castaneda met Mr. Al Plumb (100 Fair Street) for

## MINUTES OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF March 11, 2013

dinner about two months ago. Similar to statements he made during his Planning Board appearances, Mr. Plumb made many requests. The mayor replied that the village attorney would have to review the requests. Chair Switzer noted he has not heard from Mr. Plumb since. CEO Zarnstorff added that he, Village Attorney Leni, and the Mayor all met with Mr. Plumb and his contingent several weeks after the meeting with Chair Switzer. Again, Mr. Plumb made his desires known but he continued to balk at the idea of regulations. They also discussed SEQR and the necessity of a full EAF. CEO Zarnstorff has not heard from Mr. Plumb since. CEO Zarnstorff stated the Planning Board has been consistent with requests from and decisions regarding previous applicants, and what is being asked of Mr. Plumb. Member Appleby asked if Mr. Plumb is responsible for what has gone on at 100 Fair Street before he purchased it, and if so, Member Appleby feels that is unfair. Chair Switzer thought the property had been cleaned up. CEO Zarnstorff suggested a full EAF may very well identify some issues. He reminded the Board that Village Attorney David Mayer indicated the long form is necessary and if it comes back that there are no issues, then you can move on. Zarnstorff offered that is the peril of purchasing a building with that history. Member Daily also noted the South Avenue extension road that leads to Owens Road is in bad shape. Chair Switzer added that he sees an extensive amount of school bus traffic on the street and he called the BCSD Transportation Office to ask why they use South Avenue; their reply was they have permission from the village to do so. Member Locke opined that road was originally built for heavy truck traffic so it should be able to handle school buses. CEO Zarnstorff will check with DPW Supt. Donahue on the matters.

**NEXT REGULAR MEETING:** Monday, April 8, 2013 7:00pm upon application.  
Application materials due by Noon Monday, March 25, 2013.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

→ Member Locke moved, Member Daily seconded, unanimously carried that the meeting be adjourned at 7:53pm.

---

Pamela W. Krahe, Clerk