

Town of Clarence  
One Town Place, Clarence, NY 14031  
**Planning Board Minutes**  
Wednesday July 21, 2021

**Work Session 6:30 pm**

Status of TEQR Coordinated Reviews  
Review of Agenda Items  
Miscellaneous

**Agenda Items 7:00 pm**

Approval of Minutes

**Item 1**

The Broadway Group LLC  
Traditional Neighborhood District

Requests conceptual review of a proposed Dollar  
General retail store at 10340-10344 Main Street.

**Item 2**

Charles Pezzino  
Traditional Neighborhood District

Requests conceptual review of a proposed  
multiple family housing project to the rear of the  
property behind Samuel's Grande Manor at 8750  
Main Street.

Chairman Robert Sackett called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Councilman Paul Shear led the pledge to the flag.

Planning Board Members present:

Chairman Robert Sackett  
Patrick Johnson  
Jeffrey Buckley

Vice-Chair Richard Bigler  
Gregory Todaro  
Jason Geasling

Planning Board Members absent: 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-Chair Wendy Salvati  
Jason Lahti, Alternate

Town Officials Present:

Director of Community Development Jonathan Bleuer  
Junior Planner Andrew Schaefer  
Councilman Paul Shear  
Deputy Town Attorney Steven Bengart

Other Interested Parties Present:

Sally Blain	Tina Lonnie Scriven	Joseph & Kathryn Currie
Pauline Mattina	S M Maugella	Rose Marie Montreuil
Rich & Laurie Smith	Edward Woodworth	Steve Vaukins
DeAnna Hyne		

Motion by Gregory Todaro, seconded by Richard Bigler, to **approve** the minutes of the meeting held on June 16, 2021 as written.

Patrick Johnson	Abstain	Jason Geasling	Aye	Jeffrey Buckley	Aye
Gregory Todaro	Aye	Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

**Item 1**

The Broadway Group LLC  
Traditional Neighborhood District

Requests conceptual review of a proposed Dollar  
General retail store at 10340-10344 Main Street.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Bleuer introduced this project, stating that these two adjacent and vacant parcels, totaling approximately 2.2 acres are located in the Traditional Neighborhood District, and within the Clarence Hollow Overlay.

The Applicant is requesting conceptual review of an approximately 9,000 sq. ft. Dollar General Retail building.

This proposal was referred from the Town Board in February of this year.

As this proposal is located within the Traditional Neighborhood District and Hollow Overlay, final architectural approval is subject to Town Board approval, after review by the Clarence Hollow Community Character Protection Committee.

Due to the COVID pandemic, this application was administratively coordinated by the Planning Office in August of 2020. Continuing this coordinated review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act would allow for further involved and interested party comment.

Speaking on behalf of the applicant were both DeAnna Hyche, a Development Manager with the Broadway Group, and Steve Lucas with Boller Engineering.

Ms. Hyche further explained their proposed project, stating that they meet all ordinance requirements, and have limited their parking spaces to 30 spots rather than the 61 that the code allows. They have chosen to reduce that number of parking spaces in order to allow more greenspace to remain on the property.

With the help and input from the Planning Board Executive Committee, they have produced a commercial retail facility that meets the community character, the ordinance requirements, and includes a fieldstone wall which has become a trademark of the town, and will run the full length of the property.

Regarding the parking spaces, Ms. Hyche noted that they do have the room in the back of the facility to provide the additional spot, but in this case they are in front of another facility and they have truly shown that they would like to keep the greenspace.

Ms. Hyche stated that everything that has been disturbed in the development has been either sodded or seeded, providing native plantings. Their goal is to provide not only fencing, but also the trees for screening.

A monument sign which will go to the Sign Committee is also planned.

Because of the town's transparency requirements, all of the glass on the front three sides of the building are actual glass. The door that is shown in the photo is not a functioning door, but is there for additional transparency. Because it is a "corner store" layout, the door facing the main parking lot is the functioning door of the building.

Based on feedback from the Planning Board, they have hidden the HVAC mechanical units behind an enclosed retaining wall that matches the wall of the building itself.

This is not a prototypical structure for the client that they are building for this client. They have determined through the years of working with this client that they had not been meeting the characteristics of the communities that they are building in, and this his building is their attempt to do that.

Understanding that there is a separate approval process for the sign, Ms. Hyche noted that the monument sign is not internally illuminated, it will be lit with matching gooseneck lighting.

The parking lot pole light has been reduced in height upon a request by the Planning Board, to help insure that the lighting from this facility is all directed in to the parking lot. Everything that is lit on the building is shielded, also in an effort to keep it directed in to the parking lot.

The lighting in the store does stay on for one hour after the building closes to the public, to allow time for the staff to stock, clean up, and then safely get to their vehicles.

Per the Planning Board's request to remove lighting from both the front and back of the building, they have honored that request.

The only lighting that will remain on one hour after the store closes is an internal light in the two-sided glass area shown on the rendering as a vestibule, and is a requirement per the energy code in the state of New York.

Because they have been working on this proposed project since July, 2019 they have spent a lot of time with other agencies that are responsible for permitting this site. They have completed stage one and stage two approvals with the New York State Department of Transportation, therefore their commercial access is approved pending final State Environmental Quality Review Act review.

In working with the county, they have an approved, mounted septic system for the site. Through their time and research of the property, they have come to understand that bedrock is a very common finding in the area, therefore they are doing a mounted septic system.

Ms. Hyche stated that they also normally do detention in terms of drainage, but because of the shallowness of the bedrock in the area, and due to the requirements of the town, they will be using injection wells.

Within some of the correspondence that was passed along to Ms. Hyche regarding concerns with the Town, there was reference made to retaining walls. The only wall that they have on the proposed site is one that is required by town code, therefore pooling water will not be an issue.

Furthermore they have done an archaeological study that came back stating that they would not be impacting any archaeological sensitive areas, and they are not in any type of wetlands.

Steve Lucas with Boller Engineering also spoke, stating that they have met the requirements of the New York State Department of Environment and Conservation. Mr. Lucas stated that they have proposed a small water planter along the side of the building which will capture and help reduce the runoff, while the rest of the runoff will be addressed through an organic filter.

Based on the different practices, they have met the New York State Department of Environment and Conservation's requirements.

Mr. Buckley pointed out that the applicant has been working diligently with the Planning Board Executive Committee for a significant amount of time, and there have been consequential changes made as a result of those meetings.

In regards to the mechanicals which have been placed on the ground, Mr. Buckley asked whether the wall completely surrounds the mechanicals or if it's a partial wall, and if their intention is to complete the wall to hide the mechanicals from all views.

Mr. Lucas responded yes.

Ms. Hyche stated that traditionally for this type of building with this type of mechanicals, the units would go up on the top, but that was not an option with this project, because of the gabled roof, which is why they needed to come to the ground.

The wall around the mechanicals is enclosed on three sides, then gated on the 4<sup>th</sup> side to allow for access.

Mr. Buckley asked about standing water, which has been a large concern for nearby residents, noting that the stormwater drainage plan for this proposed project shows that there will be no above ground water.

Mr. Lucas responded yes.

Mr. Buckley noted that it appears as though there is a fence along the back side of the lot, asking if it is their intention to install a fence along the back of the property.

Ms. Hyche responded that the client they are working for will normally install fencing regardless of the zoning if there is any type of residential living nearby, so there will be fencing as well as trees.

Mr. Buckley stated within the correspondence received from neighboring residents, two primary concerns mentioned the lighting, which Ms. Hyche did discuss earlier in the meeting. Ms. Hyche confirmed that there will be only one light pole stand in the parking lot, with two heads.

Ms. Hyche also stated that they do photo metrics, and it is their goal that at the boundary of the property that they are developing, that they will measure 0 light spillage, which indicates that light is not spilling outside of their property boundary.

Mr. Buckley stated that another concern that has been raised is the noise and also fumes, due to trash pickup and deliveries. Mr. Buckley noted that he doesn't see any large overhead doors for loading and unloading, and asked Ms. Hyche to explain the plan for deliveries.

Ms. Hyche explained that the trucks will pull in then utilize the long stretch of driveway to back into the area behind the building so that it is not visible from the road. They will deliver to the door closest to the dumpsters.

Currently, delivery schedules are pending and Ms. Hyche will be better able to answer that question once they are further along in the process. Because this store is a proto-typical store, the client will potentially be introducing produce at this location, which may change typical deliveries. Traditionally, deliveries consist of one large truck one time a week for a time span of approximately two hours.

The larger delivery trucks are turned off during delivery, they do not idle, nor do they sit and wait for a delivery. Additionally, there are a multitude of the smaller box trucks that can deliver at any given time, with the goal being between the non-peak hours, which for this particular client would be 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. then again between 4:30 p.m. and 6:30 p.m. These smaller deliveries are scattered throughout the week, and there are a total of 12 of these vendors. The caveat to this, is that if there is fresh produce available at this location, it will add the addition of a regular delivery truck.

Mr. Buckley asked about garbage removal, Ms. Hyche responded that she will get that information and get back to the board with it once she has it.

Mr. Buckley asked Ms. Hyche whether they would be willing to accept restrictions which would prevent them from having any outside storage outside the building and against any of the outside walls. Ms. Hyche stated that they have an agreement that there will be no outside displays.

Mr. Buckley asked about temporary signage, flags, for sales or other events placed on the side of the building. Ms. Hyche replied that traditionally this client has done that when there is a Grand Opening or a need for hiring when the store opens, but this is something that can be handled and managed through agreements which they have done in the past.

Mr. Buckley reaffirmed that the lighting in the vestibule will be on 24/7 for security purposes, while the other lighting in the store will remain on for one hour after the close of business, for closing procedures as well as security reasons for the staff.

Ms. Hyche stated that a traditional store's hours of operation are 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. She does not recall any limitations in the ordinance for this store, which means that they will come on approximately 15 minutes before the store opens in the morning, and stay on until 11:00 in the evenings. Ms. Hyche added that this is also something that has been managed through agreements with towns, therefore it can be amended if necessary.

Mr. Buckley asked about the proximity to other stores, as there is a store not too far away in Akron, what research have they done to determine the proximity for the location of stores in this area specifically.

Ms. Hyche responded that the metric used is a 3-5 mile radius, and that the location of stores is based on many factors, including the number of households, traffic patterns in the area, as well as other stores in the area. It is not a destination location, it is an in and out shopping experience, and they look to serve not only the neighborhood, but the traffic pattern as well.

Ms. Hyche stated that the niche that the applicant has found in regards to metrics, has worked well for everyone involved. They will build in the most community friendly way, and once the project is complete she will not just become a face in the crowd, she will remain accessible for any issues that may arise.

Mr. Sackett asked Ms. Hyche to explain the other building materials, aside from what has already been discussed. Ms. Hyche responded that the siding is Hardie Siding, which is a better option in regards to maintenance, considering the weather that the area experiences. The Hardie siding gives it a more residential type appearance as well.

Ms. Hyche further explained the windows, which are traditional glass along the front three sides but tempered glass in the back due to lack of space to support a traditional window jam.

Mr. Bigler asked about the brick that is proposed for the façade of the building, whether it is real brick, or a brick – like material. Ms. Hyche responded that it is a sheeted brick, it is not plastic, it is made of brick and put together to form a sheet of brick, which affixes to the side of the building.

At this time, the meeting was opened for Public Participation.

- Sally Blain, resident of the Claremont. Sally stated that she has submitted a petition, letter, and photos. Mr. Sackett stated that they have all received and read the letter, which is on file at the Planning and Zoning Office.

Mrs. Blain stated that they have a beautiful view and would like to keep it the way it is. She and the other residents are there to enjoy the rest of their lives, and the store does not belong where they are proposing it to go. It will create problems for traffic traveling along Main Street, as well as residents of the Claremont as well as others.

Mrs. Blain asked that they please take in to consideration the feelings, needs, and opinions of the aging seniors.

- Rosemarie Montral, resident of the Claremont asked why the applicant isn't locating their building on the other side of Strickler, where there is much more open space.

Mrs. Montral also stated that there will be more traffic, and the view from their homes will be greatly diminished.

- Pauline McKeena, resident of the Claremont gave a brief history of her family in Clarence. She is concerned with the possible introduction of produce and garbage, with the problem of rodents.

Mrs. McKeena is also concerned about the traffic issues that may arise from having the applicant's business located there.

- Ed Woodworth owns the dental office and apartment building at 10346 Main Street.

Mr. Woodworth does not believe that the proposed project is a good fit for the community. But assuming the project is approved and progresses through the process, he has a number of concerns.

As owner of the property to the immediate east, he requests the applicant provide a privacy fence of maximum height as allowed by town regulations. The fence should be designed as a sound buffer due to quality of life impact regarding sound from car doors, vehicles, and voices during hours of operation, as well as deliveries.

His property includes two rental units, and the potential noise pollution could impact his ability to rent the apartments at current rates, as well as negatively impacting the quality of life and value of the property.

Mr. Woodworth also stated that he would like to see the project's exit and entrance portions of the parking lot placed as far west on the property as possible, in order to limit any affects that it will have on him and his patients.

He's assuming that there has been a traffic study done by the town and or state to help determine how traffic will be impacted by this project.

If there will be any blasting or digging in the construction of the well, Mr. Woodworth asked that his building and septic system be independently inspected for potential damage.

Mr. Sackett encouraged Mr. Woodworth to document his concerns and submit them to the Planning Office to be kept in the file.

With no further public participation, this portion of the meeting was closed.

Ms. Hyche addressed the concerns of the speakers, stating that she has seen the correspondence submitted that Mrs. Blain referred to, and while she does understand the Claremont's resident's concerns of their view changing, she'd like to remind the board that these are Traditional Neighborhood lots, and what they are proposing is appropriate for the location.

Regarding the references made about the driveway, because Main Street is a Department of Transportation mandated road, everything that they will do and have proposed, has been handled through the Department of Transportation. They have met and will continue to meet all of the requirements that they have set forth in terms of traffic.

Ms. Hyche stated that the normal number of transactions performed at this applicant’s stores during any point of time of the year, any event or holiday, is consistently between 15-20 transactions per hour.

Ms. Hyche reiterated that this is not considered a destination location, there are multiple stores within 3-5 miles. The reason for that metric, is that it’s not their intention to pull traffic from another area and make Main Street busier, but rather serving the traffic that is already utilizing the area.

Mr. Lucas explained that the location of the proposed building is located as far away from the Claremont as possible, and close to the road. As Ms. Hyche mentioned, they have incorporated the fencing and the trees to help buffer the view from the Claremont.

Ms. Hyche responded to the question asking why this lot for the proposed project, stating that this parcel was put under contract two years ago, while they researched multiple locations, taking every aspect in to consideration, this parcel was the best fit for the applicant.

Ms. Hyche stated that she is not opposed to the fencing along the east side of the property, but will need to look in to that, as she doesn’t believe she was aware that there are apartments in that location.

Regarding the question as to where the trees would be located, generally they place the trees on the inside of the fencing, so that the responsibility for the maintenance and upkeep remains with the applicant. If they were to place the trees on the east side of the fencing along the neighbor’s property, then she would ask and state that the trees then become that property owner’s responsibility.

The location of the driveway and access to the parking lot cannot go any further west, due to the driveway for the Claremont, as well as the Department of Transportation’s requirements.

Mr. Sackett stated that multiple comments have been made with respect to the views, landscaping and fencing. Clarence has an involved approval process, which includes a Landscape Committee that reviews and approves all landscaping, and is a separate process from the Planning Board. The Landscape Committee works with the neighbors and the applicant, in order to achieve a balanced solution.

The Planning Board will reconvene at the conclusion of the Coordinated Review, taking in to account all of the involved and interested parties, and come to a decision about concept approval.

**ACTION:**

Motion by Jeffrey Buckley, seconded by Richard Bigler that Pursuant to Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law, to **accept** the Part 1 Short Environmental Assessment Form as submitted and to seek Lead Agency status and **continue a coordinated review** among involved and interested agencies on the proposed Dollar General project at 10340-10344 Main Street in the Traditional Neighborhood District. This Unlisted Action involves the construction of an approximately 9,000 square foot retail store, parking and associated facilities.

Patrick Johnson	Aye	Jason Geasling	Aye	Jeffrey Buckley	Aye
Gregory Todaro	Aye	Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.



**Item 2**

Charles Pezzino  
Traditional Neighborhood District

Requests conceptual review of a proposed multiple family housing project to the rear of the property behind Samuel's Grande Manor at 8750 Main Street.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Bleuer introduced this project, stating that the property contains approximately 9.5 acres in the Traditional Neighborhood District and Residential Single Family zones and is home to an existing banquet facility, Samuel's Grande Manor.

The applicant is requesting conceptual review of a 24-unit multiple family housing project to the rear of the existing Samuel's Grande Manor property in the Traditional Neighborhood District. Two 33' tall buildings are proposed, each containing a ground parking floor and two floors of residential units. Each structure is approximately 30,000 square feet, containing parking and 12 residential units.

This proposal was referred from the Town Board in June of this year.

Starting a coordinated review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act would initiate a full review of this proposal.

Speaking for the applicant is Jake Metzger from Metzger Civil Engineering. Mr. Metzger further explained that the scope of the project has been revised substantially from the original plans, through working with the Planning Office, Planning Board Executive Committee, and the Town Board.

Originally there were two larger size apartment buildings planned, 20 units each, with much larger buildings, located more northeast than what is currently planned.

Based on concerns conveyed by the town, the project has been significantly scaled back. Each floor will have 6 upscale luxury apartment units, approximately 1400-1500 sq. ft. There will be an elevator in each building, a majority of the units will be two bedroom, as well as some one bedroom units.

The density on the project site has been reduced, and they do not need any variances. They will need a Special Exception Use Permit to allow for a multi-family development, as well as the size of the building.

Mr. Todaro stated part of the process is to complete a full Environmental Assessment Form, which he reviewed.

Correspondence was received from the public regarding the proposed project, which he has created a synopsis of, including who sent them.

Mr. Todaro asked what parking on the lower level refers to, Mr. Metzger responded that it is the ground level, and there is nothing below ground.

Mr. Todaro asked about the Stormwater Management System, asking Mr. Metzger to explain the plans for that. Mr. Metzger explained that because the escarpment is able to take on copious amounts of stormwater through injection wells, that would be the system they use with this project. They will use an infiltration basin and the injection well system to handle any water, that way there is no stormwater flowing off site, everything is contained on site and discharged through the bedrock.

Mr. Todaro asked about the site location, whether there is any overlay of zoning within the Traditional Neighborhood District which it is zoned, Mr. Bleuer responded no there is not.

Mr. Todaro next asked about the special use permit as well as the proximity of the proposed project sitting so close to a school and whether there are any impacts in regards to blasting. Mr. Metzger responded that there is not a plan for blasting at this time, but that there may be later on in the project, he cannot say with full certainty this early on.

Mr. Todaro asked if all parts of the project will be completed in 6 months, including parking, building, and all associated with construction, Mr. Metzger responded yes, the goal is to have the entire project completed in 6 months.

Mr. Todaro asked what non-jurisdictional wetland means, Mr. Metzger responded that during the process, they always look for any wetland or archaeological sensitive areas as part of the review process. It was determined that the wetlands were isolated, so those findings were brought to the Army Corp of Engineers, who then came to the site and confirmed the delineation. An isolated wetland means that it is not regulated by the Army Corp of Engineers, and not connected to any waterways of the United States of America. Therefore they can fill an isolated wetland without any need for remediation.

Mr. Todaro then asked if because the wetland is non-jurisdictional, does that mean that it was not discovered by a government agency. Mr. Metzger confirmed that since the Army Corp of Engineers came out and concluded that it was not connected to any waterways, they do not need to mitigate.

In regards to the potential for the increase in traffic, Mr. Todaro asked Mr. Metzger how they can answer no to the question regarding an increase in traffic if the State Environmental Quality Review Act process has not been completed yet. Mr. Metzger responded that they review the New York State Department of Transportation traffic counts for the area, and that is something which will be addressed on a Department of Transportation level, once they get the feedback.

Mr. Todaro asked what the hours of construction will be, Mr. Metzger responded that they anticipate a typical construction schedule of Monday through Friday 7am-6pm then Saturdays starting at 6am, not applicable Sundays or holidays.

Mr. Todaro then asked whether lighting during construction will cause any disruption to neighbors, Mr. Metzger replied that he doesn't anticipate nighttime construction, therefore lighting should not be an issue.

Mr. Todaro asked where the waste will be stored during construction, Mr. Metzger responded that he does not have a definitive answer for that but he will work on obtaining one and get back to him.

Mr. Todaro then asked if safety will be accounted for considering the close proximity to an elementary school from the standpoint of construction. Mr. Metzger noted that the distance between the school and

the construction area will be significant, and that distance in and of itself will provide a safety buffer. Mr. Todaro asked if there will be construction fencing up, Mr. Metzger responded that if the board chooses to make it a condition, then they would definitely put one up.

Mr. Todaro asked what an oak opening is in regards to the site being located near natural resources. Mr. Bleuer responded, stating that the oak opening is a piece of property in the nearby vicinity, exclusive to a separate area not included with this parcel, and preserved by the town's green print program.

Mr. Todaro asked about the location of the site and whether it is located on or near a historic archaeological site, as the responses conflict as stated in the State Environmental Quality Review Act questionnaire. Mr. Metzger responded that it is not necessarily located on their property, but may be in proximity to the site. The State Historical Preservation Office did issue a no impact letter, stating that there will be no historical resources impacted with this project.

Mr. Todaro read a synopsis of concerns submitted by neighbors to the planning office from the following residents and will be placed in file:

1. Patrick McGowan
2. JoAnn Lichtenthal at 4440 Overlook Drive

Based on the emails received, concerns include:

- Low-cost apartment housing which could equate to crime;
- Density concerns
- Traffic congestion
- Power demands which the residents in the area of the proposed project already suffer from
- Maintenance of the apartment property

Mr. Bengart stated that responding to questions regarding the type of housing and people that will reside there is not appropriate to question or receive a response to.

Mr. Metzger was unable to respond to the question regarding a possible price point for the apartments, therefore it will be addressed during the Coordinated Review.

Regarding the density concerns, Mr. Metzger stated that due to the size of the parcel, they could conceivably request 75 dwelling units, but instead they chose to have fewer larger units which are more upscale.

This also speaks to the concerns of maintaining the property, as is seen by Samuels Grand Manor, it is a beautiful, well cared for facility. The applicant will do the same for the proposed apartment buildings as well.

Mr. Metzger stated that he believes there is sufficient power available to serve the facility, if not they will hear from the proper authority.

Mr. Todaro asked about a previous project that Samuels Grand Manor had come to the board with, which consisted of the addition of apartments on a second story in the front of the building, and whether that project had been carried out. Mr. Metzger responded no, it has not.

Mr. Todaro asked if the applicant will be losing current parking spots due to the proposed development, Mr. Metzger responded yes. Mr. Todaro then asked whether that will affect the ability to park in the designated lot for the banquet facility without needing to have overflow of parking on to Main Street during events. Mr. Metzger stated that the applicant can speak more on that topic, but that because the nature of the business has changed so much through the years, there is not as much of a need for all of the current parking as there has been in the past.

Further discussion regarding parking for the proposed project continued.

Mr. Sackett stated that generally the board looks for a recreational component or fees in lieu of, asking if any thought has been given to that subject, Mr. Metzger responded that he is not aware of any. Mr. Sackett suggested that over the course of the Coordinated Review, they work on that.

At this time, the meeting was opened for Public Participation.

- Catherine Currie of 4460 West Overlook Dr. stated that their proximity to the building is very close, although she doesn't have her concerns prepared to discuss tonight, what she has heard at tonight's meeting has raised a lot more questions than answers.

For example, the concern about blasting, many of the residents in the area have blasted basements, she is concerned about the geological land surrounding the proposed project site. Mrs. Currie stated that she is aware of the problems that the bowling alley previously located near the site had.

Mrs. Currie stated that she is also concerned about the noise, because if she can hear music from Samuel's now, then what will happen during construction with all of the noise.

Traffic is also a concern, as previously stated.

- Lonnie Scriven of 4480 West Overlook Dr. was concerned about the limited information provided regarding the sewage and wastewater management system on the site. He reviewed the application and read that approximately 4,000 gallons need to be distributed. Mr. Scriven would like to know how this will be handled. Mr. Scriven pointed out the single family property in the back of the site and the leech fields that are proposed for that portion of the property. He believes that the leech fields are too small.

Mr. Scriven also asked if there is any thought given to the process as far as enforcing the wetlands. He pointed out that there are 19.9 acres that are listed on the DEC site that covers quite a bit of the property in the back that the applicant plans to use.

Mr. Scriven also asked if the bowling alley, which was previously located near the site, sank. He would like to know how the applicant plans to get rid of the site water. He knows that the project plans are preliminary, but would like to know if the project will come back up before the board.

- Laurie Smith of 4470 West Overlook stated that she is very close to Samuel's. She urged the board to consider how close to proximity the proposed project is to the school. Not only the building but the playground, with the leech fields and blasting. She urges the board to consider this project with all of these issues.

With no further public participation, this portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Metzger touched on the issues that are of concern, beginning with the foundation and previous issues with the bowling alley. There will be studies done on the project before any building is erected, the owner understands that. Samuel’s Grand Manor has been in operation for over 40 years, and there has not been any issues with the foundation.

Mr. Metzger stated that because he stated that there is a possibility of blasting, does not mean that there will definitely be blasting. Rather than say there definitely will not be any blasting, and have it end up needing to be blasting, he left the possibility open.

Traffic will obviously be studied by the Department of Transportation, which is why they are requesting to start this process. Any concerned or interested parties will provide their input regarding this project.

As part of the process in discussion with the Town Board, they asked the applicant to contact the Department of Environmental Conservation as well as the Department of Health to confirm that a project of this size would be appropriate and preliminarily approved for construction, which they have done. Obviously it will need to be designed in accordance with all Health Department rules and standards.

**ACTION:**

Motion by Gregory Todaro, seconded by Jason Geasling, pursuant to Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law, to **accept** the Part 1 Long Environmental Assessment Form as submitted and to seek Lead Agency status and **commence a coordinated review** among involved and interested agencies on the proposed Pezzino Multiple Family Housing project at 8750 Main Street in the Traditional Neighborhood District. This Type I Action involves the construction of a multi-family housing project behind Samuel’s Grande Manor, featuring 24 multiple family units, parking and associated facilities.

**ON THE QUESTION:**

Mr. Bleuer stated that if and when this project returns to a Planning Board meeting, all neighbors who have been notified, will continue to be notified.

Patrick Johnson	Aye	Jason Geasling	Aye	Jeffrey Buckley	Aye
Gregory Todaro	Aye	Richard Bigler	Aye	Robert Sackett	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Amy Major  
Senior Clerk Typist