

Special meeting of the Planning Board of the Village of Brockport was held in the Conference Room, Municipal Building, 49 State Street, Brockport, New York, Monday, March 28, 2005 at 6:00pm.

PRESENT: Chair R. Scott Winner, Vice Chair John Brugger, Member Charles Switzer, Member Arthur Appleby, Building/Zoning Officer Scott C. Zarnstorff, Village Clerk Leslie Ann Morelli.

EXCUSED: Member Annette Locke, Deputy Village Attorney Frank A. Aloï

ALSO PRESENT: Village Engineer Tom Carpenter of Chatfield Engineers, Kris Schultz, Norbert Hausner, Jim & Joan Hamlin, Akin Awopetu, Sean Kaplan, Jack Wahl, Fred Webster.

CALL TO ORDER: Since there was not a quorum at the start of the special meeting Chair Winner announced that the meeting would operate like a workshop, as members were able to filter in.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Application of: Name: Schultz Associates for Canalside Estates
 Address: East Avenue
 Purpose: continue SEQR and home style rendering review for subdivision and site plan of proposed 40 single family homes and 141 1-4 unit senior houses with homeowner's association

Chair Winner, Member Appleby, Scott Zarnstorff and Tom Carpenter began reviewing updated plans with Kris Schultz and Norbert Hausner. As time went on, Members Switzer and Brugger joined.

K. Schultz and N. Hausner reviewed the first plat that outlined the single-family lots. Chair Winner said the discussion on this at the last meeting was a little fuzzy as to whether these homes would be in the homeowner's association or not and if sold to other builders, how they would match the architecture and continuity of the rest of the development. N. Hausner said the control of the architecture is clear to him, but the developer's attorney is drafting a document so they will be mandated to use the same or similar materials.

S. Zarnstorff asked if the doubles and quads would be individually owned. K. Schultz said they would be treated like condos where each unit is owned. S. Zarnstorff asked if the strength of homeowners associations fade away over the years. K. Schultz and N. Hausner agreed that they actually get worse as far as adding more rules over time. They self-police and when a complaint is brought before the association, it often results in a new rule or regulation. S. Zarnstorff asked if the municipality would necessarily know if a homeowner's association had disbanded. N. Hausner said they couldn't disband. It is a legal documented entity that is insured, files taxes and such. They can take a less active role, but it will always exist. S. Zarnstorff asked if accessory structures (sheds, pools, etc.) would be limited or prohibited. N. Hausner said the homeowner's association would likely prohibit them. S. Zarnstorff reminded them that at the last meeting, they mentioned the units would be good for seniors or a single parent. If that is the case, there might be a need to store bicycles or wading pools. Chair Winner asked if the single-family homes would be allowed accessory structures. N. Hausner said they would have to give that some thought. The strength will be the cohesive nature of the document. The single-family homes may not be all that different than the single-family units. However, they will meet Village code by having 80-foot minimum frontage and 10,000 square foot minimum lot size. They will not be cluster lots. T. Carpenter asked if they were still considering a re-zoning application to Q-district. K. Schultz said yes, but they feel the regular lot size makes sense for the single-family homes.

N. Hausner reviewed the next plan. He said they originally looked at a 10-foot separation between units, but were able to provide a 15-foot separation wall to wall. Chair Winner said he appreciates the work they have done, but the density still needs to be addressed further. He expressed concern of the proximity of the buildings to each other and the lack of community space. The largest area of green space provided is the 3 to 4 acres in one spot that is mostly water. He questioned where the common green is to assemble, throw a Frisbee or such. Where is a pocket park to assemble or play?

6:22pm - Member Switzer entered. N. Hausner said the amount of green space here is about the same as that provided in McCormick Place next door. Chair Winner said McCormick Place is entirely senior-oriented and has one-third the number of structures. This proposal is a bigger scope and is likely to have some family housing aspects. N. Hausner said there is green space behind the multi-family units. Chair Winner said it is ill defined. It should promote the outdoor living room concept. S. Zarnstorff questioned one particular area. K. Schultz said that is a wetland area with minimal disturbance allowed.

T. Carpenter suggested trying to spread the units out more so it does not feel so crowded. K. Schultz said they held at the 30-foot front setback, but a 25-foot front setback might be better in some places. Chair Winner said the less driveway for seniors the better. K. Schultz said they would be willing to give up in one area on setbacks to allow more front yard / driveway space for the single-family homes.

Member Switzer said he is not convinced of the adequacy of a sidewalk on only one side of the street,

particularly in the senior areas. N. Hausner said sidewalks on both sides would be more costly and would make it even more dense. Member Switzer referred to McCormick Place and said that particular
MINUTES OF MEETING HELD March 28, 2005 continued.....page 2

plan warranted a sidewalk on only one side of the street.

K. Schultz shared a concept called “coving” in which a rolling setback line breaks up the lineal stack.

T. Carpenter pointed out a couple of areas that seem awfully tight. Member Appleby agreed and suggested taking out 2 single-family homes to open it up. Chair Winner said it is not the job of the Planning Board to tell the developer how many units to build, but to convey concerns when they think the density is too high. N. Hausner said he understands the Board’s thoughts on the density, but the suggestions are somewhat ambiguous. He agreed with T. Carpenter’s characterization of a few “hot spots” that need work and softening. He said the coving concept might help.

6:35pm – With 3 of 5 members in attendance, Chair Winner officially called the meeting to order and stated that they would continue in workshop setting and conclude by 7pm when the ZBA meeting begins.

Member Switzer asked if they propose access to the east. K. Schultz said this subdivision goes to the Village line. That property is currently Sodoma farmland in the Town of Sweden. There is no telling what that land could be in the future, plus it is in a different municipality.

K. Schultz showed how they rotated some of the units and sacrificed a double for a single. Chair Winner said it formalizes it and provides for a more visual destination. Chair Winner questioned the orientation and said he would like to see the corners reduced to singles to anchor them. K. Schultz showed where they could drop one area to all singles.

Chair Winner questioned snow removal and the benefits of the proposed cul de sacs with landscaped islands. N. Hausner said the landscaping would be in the center and the snow would be placed on the outer rim. He said the homeowners association plows all the driveways, so they will be able to handle it.

K. Schultz said the snow season is a few months, whereas the benefit of the island is year round.
Chair

Winner asked why they didn’t repeat the pattern of cul de sacs. They are each a little different. N. Hausner said they differ due to the number of units on them. N. Hausner said they could flip the duplex and quad locations, but they want to keep the quads in the cul de sacs to make it look more like a neighborhood.

N. Hausner showed sketches of the proposed duplex with façade stone, mission windows, peaked ceiling in the dining room, front and back porch or patio and single car garage. All will have basements. The singles will be one story and have a 2-car garage. One option will offer a second floor bonus room.

They will have nice column structures and bow and bay windows.

6:47pm – Member Brugger entered. N. Hausner said the quad would have gables, clapboard bracket detail, stone facades, etc. All will have the unit number and fence detail in forward ground. N. Hausner said he would have sketches of five different single-family units to review at the next meeting. Member Switzer asked about rear windows in the single-family units. N. Hausner said they would try to get view out back wherever possible.

SEQR –

Chair Winner referred to T. Carpenter’s review letter dated March 24th. T. Carpenter recommends this project be classified an Unlisted Action according to the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) regulations. He recommends a Coordinated Review be done for this project, due to more than one agency being involved, the size of the development and the proximity to the Canal. This will demonstrate that the Village Planning Board has made a reasonable attempt to complete a thorough environmental review.

⇒ Member Brugger moved, Member Switzer seconded, unanimously carried:
RESOLVED, that in accordance with the New York State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) procedures, the Village of Brockport Planning Board hereby expresses its intent to serve as Lead Agency in the coordinated environmental review of the Brockport Canalside Estates Subdivision proposal.

FURTHER RESOLVED, the Village of Brockport Planning Board will notify the Involved and Interested Agencies of its intention to act as Lead Agency for this project and will provide them with a copy of the Planning Board application form, Part 1 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form and a Conceptual Site Plan.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Monday, April 11, 2005

ADJOURNMENT:

- ➔ Member Appleby moved, Member Brugger seconded, unanimously carried that the meeting be adjourned at 6:58pm.

Leslie Ann Morelli, Village Clerk