

A public meeting of the Town of Victor Planning Board was held on January 13, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present:

PRESENT: Joe Logan, Chairman; Joe Limbeck, Vice-Chairman, Scott Harter, Al Gallina

ABSENT: Ernie Santoro,

OTHERS: David Nankin, Francis Rose, Steve Lamarco, Bryan White, James Cretekos, Doug Eldred, David Palmer, Felipe Meto, Francis Clement, Davidd Wright, Scott Reinhart, Mark Fuentes, Kathleen Valenti, Francis Gorman, Wes Pettee, Town Engineer; Keith Maynard II, Project Manager; Suzy Mandrino, Manager of Technology Support, Lisa Boughton, Secretary.

The meeting was opened, the Flag was saluted, and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

On motion of Al Gallina, seconded by Scott Harter:

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the meeting held on October 15, 2025, October 30, 2025, November 12, 2025, and December 9, 2025, BE APPROVED.

Adopted 5 Ayes, 0 Nays

CORRESPONDENCE:

Tammy VanBuren re: Eastview Mall

Dave Anderson re: Eastview Mall

BOARDS AND COMMITTEE UPDATES:

Town Board representative Dave Condon was present.

Councilman Condon - Not a lot to report tonight. I just wanted to let you know that we had our organizational meeting. We welcomed Jen Tipton, who's a new board member. She was sworn in the other night and she's taking over from Mike Guinan, who stepped down, kind of retired after 50 years of service. I think he's going to stay on the LDC and stay active, but he's no longer on the Town Board. Jen, myself and Drew Cusimano will be your liaisons this year. We're each taking a four-month rotation and we'll try to cover for each other when they can't make it. And the other thing I wanted to encourage you is that throughout the year you. If you have questions that come up and comments or things that you'd like, more clarification from the board, reach

out. I mean we're all pulling the rope in the same direction. We're all trying to do what's right by our town. And I think that communication piece is really important. And I thank you for your service. I haven't had a chance to see Tricia here, but I'm pleased to see her. And you know, you veterans have given up a lot of your time and continue to do so, and I appreciate that. So I just wanted to thank you for that.

PLANNING BOARD reported by Keith Maynard

Tuesday, January 27, 2026

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- AT&T Cingular, located at 914 Brownsville Road, applicant is requesting approval to modify the equipment on the 140-foot lattice tower. This will include installing three antennas, six pipe to pipe clamps, three 2 by 12 inch and 10-inch pipes.
- Valenti Minor Subdivision, located at 6948 Aldridge Road, applicant is requesting approval to subdivide a 7.04-acre parcel into two proposed lots. Lot one will consist of 6.408 acres and the. And the existing house. Lot two will consist of 0.623 acres and that's at 6948 Aldridge Road.
- Victor Community Church Front Addition, located at 7500-7512 State Route 251, applicant is requesting approval to construct an expansion of 6920 square feet for additional classroom and activity space. And it'll be on the front of the church.
- Woods at Valentown Section 1 Reapproval, located at High Point Drive, applicant is requesting the reapproval of the expired site plan for section one.

The legal notice for the public hearings appeared in "The Daily Messenger" along with "Under Review" signs being posted on the subject parcels. Post Cards were mailed to property owners within a minimum of 500 ft from location for the initial public hearing date of each application. For applications carried over please refer to the Planning and Building Office.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

CENTOLA SITE PLAN

Baker Road

Owner – Ronald and Susan Centola

Tax Map # 1.02-1-31.200

Applicant is requesting approval to requesting approval to construct a single-family home on 2 acres. This was part of the Vincent Subdivision in 2024.

34-SP-2025

Zoned – Residential

Chairman Logan – This application has been removed until a further meeting.

BARBER SITE PLAN

35-SP-2025

Benson Road

Zoned – Limited Development District

Owner – Patrick Barber

Tax Map # 6.01-1-29.300

Applicant is requesting approval to construct a single-family home on 18.2 acres.

Chairman Logan – This application has been removed until a further meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

Speakers are requested to limit comments to 3 minutes and will be asked to conclude comments at 5 minutes.

7275 STATE ROUTE 96 FACADE

37-SP-2025

7275 State Route 96

Zoned – Commercial/Light Industrial

Owner – FarmerLED LLC

Tax Map #15.00-1-10.100

Applicant is requesting approval to paint the exterior of a portion of the building and to add an additional tenant entrance.

Mike Parker, the owner.

Mr. Parker - Well, it's a very kind of a odd building with the ownership of it. The Hadlock's portion is owned by them. We purchased the corner, the front corner. It's kind of like a three, almost like a condo type complex. And the parking lot is the third. So we own that corner, about 17,000 square feet of that corner.

Chairman Logan - And are you subdividing that piece?

Mr. Parker - Be three tenants within it. There's was existing. There was two currently. And we're subdividing the inside as well.

Chairman Logan - If you could describe what's going on or how much is being subdivided within that space.

Mr. Parker - It's kind of in thirds, I guess it's pretty even maybe a little bit bigger on the front store front side. And then there's a warehouse in the middle. And then there's the FLX dog Training park is in that side.

Chairman Logan - And that's on the back side, as I understand it.

Mr. Parker – Yes, it's kind of on the 250 side or 251 side there.

Chairman Logan - And the other thing I understand is there's a. There's already an entrance for that. The dog.

Mr. Parker - It's just kind of a side man door there on the end. And we wanted to put a formal entrance for that business.

Chairman Logan - There's an unusual property definition for your piece, meaning that the face of the building is the property line. Is that correct? So, you don't have the sidewalks on your property. You don't have parking on your property, technically speaking. And if you can describe for the board and the public how parking is worked out between amongst the different tenants both in your section of your building and Hadlock's.

Mr. Parker -All of that parking is common, technically. I mean, we all. We all use all of it. The owner of the parking lot, I believe, also owns Hadlock's as well. The owner of the building or the owner of the Hadlock's also owns the parking lot piece. So, we don't just own that one section of the building. It's like I said, it's kind of like three different parcels within the one. So, it's sort of an odd piece of land or an odd piece of, you know, building.

Chairman Logan - So do you have a written or formal arrangement or agreement for use of that parking?

Mr. Parker – Yes, I submitted that with the application approval from them. They're very agreeable to all the stuff that we're planning to do and are happy about the improvements as well.

Chairman Logan - Okay, I will. I've been asking all the questions, I guess, just to kind of get everything defined out here, but anyone from the board have comments, questions? Joe, we'll start with you.

Mr. Parker - So each tenant will have their own signage. They'll have to put in their own sign, permits and variance permit. You know, all the permits that they'll need to do. So, the original side for our portion of this, it's going to be just like that. We're going to set it up for them to have the facade to put their signage on and they'll have to get it approved through your guys, through your meetings.

Mr. Limbeck - So the question from the zoning folks is whether we want to do a variance for the lighting, I believe. Is that something we want to talk about now too?

Chairman Logan - Everything's on the table.

Mr. Limbeck - I'm not sure what the issue is or if we're interested. I'm not concerned about issuing the variance, but I'm not sure. So I'm not sure if it's something that we should have opinion one way or the other about. It doesn't seem like it's a major issue to me at this point.

Chairman Logan - Well, where's the lighting issue?

Ms. Boughton – They didn't supply a lighting plan, but the Code Officer did say that the Planning Board can waive that requirement for the lighting plan.

Mr. Parker - So we have a lighting plan in the drawings for the build out as part of the actual building permit set that we have. The building set or the building permit is, it's underway. We've started some of the inside stuff. The outside stuff is obviously planning or pending the planning board approval. The side facade, the new entry facade has lighting. Has lighting in it. And I don't know whether you guys have driven by that building. It's pretty well lit at night along the down lighting along the facade as well. So, it'll just add the can lights will kind of be in the same spot. They'll just be at the entryway.

Mr. Limbeck - So the code fellows are just looking for actual documentation on the plans that. This exists to include it in the plans.

Mr. Gallina - No questions. Just a comment. It's good to see the building get, you know, repurposed reused. And I agree with you. I think the facade looks appealing.

Ms. Turner - I agree the facade looks. It just looks great. I think it's going to be a great addition. Just driving by, it's pretty close. I come through there all the time, so I'm looking forward to seeing that.

Mr. Harter - I had a couple of questions. So, the building lighting is contained within the soffit, Is that what you're saying? So, it's not even visible?

Mr. Parker - No, it's all can lights up in there.

Mr. Harter - It's all focused downward.

Mr. Parker - I mean depending on what the people decide for signage, that'll be approved by you guys as well. But there could be some light in the signs probably.

Mr. Harter - But no pole mounted lighting out there. The other question I had related to the survey because I did the survey some time ago on the map that was presented and I think you have two lots. Is that correct? Two lots on the property.

Mr. Parker - There's two within the building. Ours is one and then. So, we're 7275 and then Hadlock's is 7273. And the third lot is the parking lot.

Mr. Maynard - And it's confusing, Scott. We had to go back and forth with the assessor on it. If you look at it on OnCor, it looks like it's three lots. It's not. It's their lot and then the parking lot and the rest of the building are the same lot. They're separated for tax purposes. Has to do with the lease between Hadlock's and the owner. But like he said earlier, the same person owns the whole parking lot and the Hadlock's part of the building and that is the same lot. And then their lot is separate.

Mr. Harter - That's the way the survey shows it, I believe. Because I remember when we did the survey and I only remember two lots. I don't remember three lots. But as long as it's okay with

you folks, that's fine with me. I thought maybe we were gaining a lot here that I didn't know about. I don't have any more questions.

Chairman Logan - I'll echo the board's comments on the fact that you will be bringing in new tenants. And it'll be good occupied space and it looks good. What you, what you've proposed. I want to open it up to the public before we conclude this discussion. So, if there's anyone that may have questions for the applicant or comments on the project, step up or seeing none, entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

The Board was okay with closing the public hearing.

On motion of Scott Harter, seconded by Trisha Turner, RESOLVED, that the public hearing was closed.

Chairman Logan - Okay, so the public hearing is closed. There was a comment that we had in a staff meeting that I understand that if the facade, if it bumps out away from the face of the building, it's now not on your parcel.

Mr. Parker - It overhangs slightly.

Chairman Logan - Is there a need for an agreement or some variance for that? I guess. I don't know. Wes are you familiar with that.

Mr. Pettee – I remember that we did talk about that during a staff meeting and I see that the existing facade. If I'm looking at the street view on Google street view, I see that the existing facade where the sign would be installed, it looks like there is a projection that comes out of the sidewalk a bit.

Mr. Parker - It's the same as the front. Like the corner one. So it would be the same, the same distance out into that. You know that was already there.

Mr. Pettee - So any new work that's going on with the facade isn't going to project any further out away from.

Mr. Parker - It's very similar like very similar to that bump out just like that. Because that one actually like we just kind of are wrapping it with the new materials and then building like a mirror image in a smaller version on the side.

Chairman Logan - So this man door, is that for the dog?

Mr. Parker - That's what she's currently using? Yes. And we're going to leave that. So that'll be like her secondary means of exit. And then the main door will be where that first tree is.

Chairman Logan - And that, that will look a lot like this one. Well with the new architecture of course.

Mr. Parker – So it's like a mini version. It's only just a two-door entryway.

Chairman Logan - I have nothing else unless anyone else has any other comments. I think we do have a draft resolution. Hearing is closed. So I'll read that.

Chairman Logan read the draft resolution.

DECISION:

On motion of Al Gallina, seconded by Joe Limbeck:

WHEREAS, the Planning Board made the following findings of fact:

1. A site plan application was received on December 5, 2025, from Michael Parker of 7275 State Route 96, LLC (the “Applicant”) by the Secretary of the Planning Board for a Site Plan entitled 7275 State Route 96 Façade (the “Project”).
2. It is the intent of the applicant to paint the exterior of a portion of the building and to add an additional tenant entrance.
3. A public hearing was duly called for and notice of said public hearing was published in “The Daily Messenger” and whereby all property owners within a minimum of 500-feet of the Site were notified by U.S. Mail. An “Under Review” sign was posted on the subject parcel as required by Town Code.
4. The Planning Board held a public hearing on January 13, 2026, at which time the public was permitted to speak on their application.
5. The Action is classified as an Unlisted Action pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act Regulations, and the applicant provided Part I of the Short Environmental Assessment Form.
6. The Town of Victor Code Enforcement Officer reviewed the application and provided comments in a letter dated December 17, 2025, and January 13, 2026.

WHEREAS, the Town of Victor Planning Board reviewed the Unlisted Action on January 13, 2026, and identified no significant impacts; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the project, 7275 State Route 96 Façade will not have a significant impact on the environment and that a negative declaration be prepared.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the application of Michael Parker of 7275 State Route 96, LLC, Site Plan entitled 7275 State Route 96 Façade, drawn by Professional

Engineering Group, dated December 2021, received by the Planning Board December 5, 2025, Planning Board Application No. 37-SP-2025, BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

Conditions to be addressed prior to the chairman’s signature on the site plan:

- 1. That no final signatures will be given on the plans until all legal and engineering fees have been paid as per Fee Reimbursement Local Law adopted November 25, 1996.
- 2. That comments from Code Enforcement Officer, dated January 13, 2026, be addressed.
- 3. That any exterior lighting be compliant with Chapter 131 (Lighting) of the Victor Town Code and be approved by the Code Enforcement Officer.

Ongoing conditions:

- 1. That the site plan comply with Town of Victor Design and Construction Standards for Land Development, including Section 4.
- 2. That a building permit be obtained prior to start of construction from the Planning and Building Department.

AND, BE IT FURTHER, RESOLVED, that the Planning Board Secretary distribute the Planning Board’s approval letter.

This resolution was put to a vote with the following results:

Joe Logan	Aye
Al Gallina	Aye
Scott Harter	Aye
Joe Limbeck	Aye
Trisha Turner	Aye

Approved 5 Ayes, 0 Opposed

AT&T CINGULAR WIRELESS

701 High Street
Owner – New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC
Tax Map # 15.00-2-74.000/CGLR

10-SU-2025

Zoned – Residential

Applicant is requesting approval to modify its equipment on the 140 ft lattice tower. It will include removing (9) antennas, (6) radio units, (3) TMA and installing new equipment. No groundwork is proposed and there will not be an increase in tower height.

Keith Maynard, Project Manager for the Town of Victor.

Mr. Maynard - Again. So, the applicant is a few hours away and with weather coming in, she asked us today if it's a pretty simple application, if I could read a blurb she sent. So that's what I'm going to do. So as the Chairman just stated, it's AT&T. It's for a special use permit. 701 High street this is the cell tower that stands right next to the water tower. The scope of the work includes replacing the nine existing antennas, six radios with nine new antennas and six new radios, removing three tower mounted amplifiers that will not be replaced, and installing one surge arrestor with one new DC line. These changes will not increase the tower height. The new antennas and equipment will be installed on the previously approved antenna centerline. As far as groundwork is concerned, there is none proposed, so the dimension of the ground space will not change. And then per code for the special use permit in your packets should be the tower inspection report dated 8-5-2024. So it's they're just replacing some equipment on an existing cell tower right next to the water tower on High Street.

Chairman Logan - So effectively, just for the board's sake, they won't see a difference when they're done.

Mr. Maynard - Correct. That is our understanding.

Chairman Logan - There's nothing higher, nothing requiring additional lighting or any other equipment. It's right.

Mr. Maynard - And they will also have to get a building permit like any other cell changes like this. If you have any questions, I probably can't answer them.

Chairman Logan - We can chat about it anyway. Tricia, any comments for you?

Ms. Turner - I guess my question, and you said you probably can't answer it, but will the radio frequency emissions remain below what the FCC maximum permissible exposure would be with these updates and these changes?

Ms. Boughton - Applicant, I think is going to try to watch on YouTube. So, if we give her a moment.

Ms. Turner - And then my other question would be, is there any going to be any radio frequency compliance studies done after the updating of the equipment just to monitor. Just because it's right next to senior housing. It's down the street from the schools. There's a neighborhood. So my question is just. Because that's just something I would just want to make sure with the updating of equipment, is that going to pose any more serious, you know, risks? Because it is immersed next to all these facilities that I think it's something that should be monitored and you know, to do some sort of study during the peak operating conditions just to make sure that there is no impact to the community.

Ms. Boughton - So she said, yes, the emissions will be within FCC guidelines.

Ms. Turner - So part two question is, will there be an RF compliance study done to ensure that once those changes are put into effect during peak operating time to make sure that that is not impacting the area.

Ms. Boughton - We have like a 20 second delay for you too. So, I'll give her a minute.

Ms. Turner - That's just because it's literally right next to a senior center. It's right down the street from a school. And I just want to make sure there's not going to be any kind of impact. And that's just something I think we should.

Chairman Logan - As I understand it, they're replacing equipment intuitively for me at least, I wouldn't have seen that as any more invasive or intrusive in terms of radio frequencies and what's already there. But let her answer that.

Ms. Boughton - She does say we can request a post-installation study.

Chairman Logan - If we can put that in the ongoing conditions, that that request is, is going to be honored and followed up. And I don't know how much time you want to give them, but perhaps once the installation has been accepted as complete, perhaps we monitor two months later or something to that effect.

Mr. Maynard - It's not something we typically. I don't know what they do on their end and what the government regulates that they do. But like on our end, like there's the final electrical certificate with the building permit. We don't require any testing after the fact. Just saying that we don't require any testing like that in general with any of the cell stuff, like with the building permit. Like anything else that involves electricity. We would involve the third party electrical inspection. But I don't think there's any other testing that we require to submit.

Ms. Boughton – They are required to submit annual report. All cell companies.

Mr. Harter – I do not have anything.

Mr. Gallina – All set.

Chairman Logan - It is a public hearing. I'll see if there's anyone in the audience. Thank you, public. Thank you, Keith. I appreciate it. So hearing none or seeing none?

The Board was okay with closing the public hearing.

On motion of Al Gallina, seconded by Scott Harter, RESOLVED, that the public hearing was closed.

Chairman Logan read the draft resolution.

DECISION:

On motion of Al Gallina, seconded by Trisha Turner:

WHEREAS, the Planning Board made the following findings of fact:

1. A Special Use Permit application was received on December 8, 2025, from AT&T Mobility (the “Applicant”), by the Secretary of the Planning Board for a Site Plan entitled AT&T Cingular Wireless (the “Project”).
2. Applicant is requesting approval to modify its equipment on the 140 ft lattice tower. It will include removing (9) antennas, (6) radio units, (3) TMA and installing new equipment. No groundwork is proposed and there will not be an increase in tower height.
3. A public hearing was duly called for and was published in “The Daily Messenger” and whereby all property owners within a minimum of 500’ of the application were notified by U.S. Mail.
4. The Planning Board held a public hearing on January 13, 2026, at which time the public was invited to speak on their application.
5. The Action is classified as an Unlisted Action pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act Regulations, and the applicant provided Part I of the Long Environmental Assessment Form.
6. The proposed use is designed and located to be operated such that the public health, safety and welfare and convenience are protected.
7. The proposed use will not cause substantial injury to the value of other property in the neighborhood.
8. The proposed use conforms to all applicable regulations in the district which it is located.
9. The Codes Dept reviewed the application December 11, 2025, and stated that an annual report is required to be provided indicating that property maintenance is being conducted on the tower and that a building permit is required for the proposed work.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the application of Martha Grady, Agent for AT&T, 750 W Center Street, Suite 301, West Bridgewater, MA, Site Plan entitled AT&T,

located at 701 High Street, drawn by Azimuth Engineering P. C., dated October 09, 2025, received by the Planning Board Secretary December 08, 2025, Planning Board Special Use Application No. 10-SU-2025 BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. That the site plan comply with Town of Victor Design and Construction Standards for Land Development, including Section 4.
2. The applicant conduct a post installation radio frequency study to identify the levels of radio frequency radiation emitted by the updated equipment. And a copy of said study be provided to the town of Victor planning and Building office.

Chairman Logan - Can we also put in there comparison of pre and post install. See what's it before, what's it after.

Mr. Pettee - So we'll add that the study identify the comparison between existing conditions.

Chairman Logan - And conditions post installation within, do you have a time frame in there, Wes?

Mr. Pettee - I don't have a time frame in here, but like to see it done within first quarter or something. Maybe two or three months. Within three months of project completion.

Chairman Logan - And I guess bringing it online. You couldn't do it otherwise. So I assume you can only bring it online once the C of O.

Mr. Pettee - There may be a completion certificate that maybe they might get from the building office or.

Mr. Maynard - Yes, there'd be a C of C for that, for the building permit itself.

Chairman Logan - All right, so post C of C within three months, study and submit it to the planning department. All right. And Wes, you can take a look at that when it comes in and.

3. That a building permit be obtained before proposed work.

AND, BE IT FURTHER, RESOLVED, that the Planning Board Secretary distribute the Planning Board's approval letter.

This resolution was put to a vote with the following results:

Joe Logan	Aye
Al Gallina	Aye
Scott Harter	Aye
Joe Limbeck	Aye
Trisha Turner	Aye

Approved 5 Ayes, 0 Opposed

THIRSTY TURTLE SITE PLAN MODIFICATION

38-SP-2025

7422 State Route 96

Zoned –Commercial/Light Industrial

Owner – 7422 Pittsford-Victor Road Inc.

Tax Map # 15.00-2-20.200

Applicant is requesting approval to install a temporary fence or a color change to the temporary storage structure located in the northeast back parking lot. Also proposed is building lighting color change to coincide with holidays.

Ted Rund owner of Thirsty Turtle.

Mr. Rund - First, we'd like to talk about the lights. I guess we had some permanent lighting put in instead of spending, frankly, thousands of dollars a year during the holiday seasons. And at the time I didn't realize that I was in violation of them being intermittent. That's kind of how this all started. So wanted to see if we could get permission to change colors for certain holidays. Like green for St. Patty's Day or purple for Halloween or something of that nature and. And then the rest of the time just leave it white, as shown maybe in some of the photos.

Chairman Logan - So is it the lighting that covers the patio or anywhere else?

Mr. Rund - It's under the eave on the front side of the building, and then you can see it on the eaves. First timer here, located up here and then just underneath that really, I guess just shines down on the building. But I mean, that's pretty much it when it comes to the lights.

Chairman Logan - So lightings already installed. You have the ability to change and do basically anything you want to do with them. There's some constriction or constraints that are on a business about that. Obviously, the intermittent, you know, red, green, yellow, whatever, flashing isn't an acceptable thing. It's kind of a driver distraction. So, on the lighting issue, I guess we can have that conversation first. Anybody have any questions for the applicant?

Mr. Limbeck - I'm trying to sort through the comments from the code folks, and there seems to be a lot of varying conditions that can or should be met. And I'm not sure which apply or which we should be considering. Frankly, I like the idea of the decorative lighting. St. Patrick's Day. Would it be just for the day, or would it be a day prior, during and after? Or how long would the lighting be? Like, how long would it be green?

Mr. Rund - Well, I mean, that's a great question, and I can honestly say that we've been there for 25 years operating, and we still seem to find people that have never stopped at the Thirsty Turtle before. So, I guess it's my intention, and it was our plan to make our building attractive to help us survive. You know, a very tough business. The industry is not easy, and it got extremely harder after Covid. And I still seem to find people that will say, oh, your building looks so good. When did you paint it? And we did that three years ago. So, I think the tough thing is that. And I myself drive to work three or four times a day. So you drive by something so many times, you just kind

of forget that it's there at times. So, I would just maybe ask you guys what you think is appropriate. I mean, Obviously, if maybe St. Patty's Day was on a Sunday, we were allowed to

do it for the weekend. Like Friday, Saturday, Sunday, to be festive. That would be great, but certainly not going to, I guess I'm just going to lead with what you guys recommend.

Mr. Limbeck - How many colors does your system provide for? Could you do red, white, and blue for fourth of July?

Mr. Rund - Well, we're. Most of us are avid Bills fans, so we were very excited to be advertising this, I guess, but didn't realize that we were in violation. So once codes let us know. I stopped that right away. We can do red, white, and blue. Since I'm being spoken to by the codes, I've just left it white because I'm not trying to make anyone mad at me.

Mr. Limbeck - Because the idea is pretty good. But it conceivably I can come up with probably 20 at least different things I would want to celebrate with lights and what's appropriate and what length of time is appropriate. And I'm not sure if I got an answer. I like the idea, but I think there's details to be fleshed out.

Chairman Logan - I know that at Christmas time, I think there's like a one month window that businesses have to put up decorations, you know, lighting for decorations, building lighting or yard lighting or whatever for commercial purposes to celebrate the, I'll call it the seasonal holiday time. Probably Thanksgiving to New Year's, but I don't know is, I mean, Halloween is one night. St. Patty's Day is a day.

Mr. Limbeck - You know, then we've got Valentine's Day and we've got Easter and we've got fourth of July, we've got Memorial Day. We could do Kwanza. I mean, we could go nuts.

Chairman Logan - You could. I honestly don't have a problem if it's a couple of days, you know, I mean, it sounds like you're.

Mr. Limbeck - That seems reasonable to me. And, and the thought of over the weekend, for instance, I think that makes sense to me.

Chairman Logan - I guess if it was a few days leading up to whatever it was, whether it was a Friday, Monday or Saturday or whatever. Sure. Three days.

Mr. Limbeck - That's kind of where I'm headed. I like the idea of just a lead up to the day.

Chairman Logan - I mean, it seems kind of arbitrary and as long as it's not flashing in a totally distraction. Which is the problem with the flashing lights then. I don't see why you couldn't do that. It's not like you're putting searchlights in the sky and all that kind of stuff that you might see it in Vegas or something. Maybe if we say other than Christmas time or the holiday season, it's a three day centered around or leading up to a particular event. If you want to, you can define the number of events you have, but I don't think that's a problem if you have to add one from one time to time, even every Sunday for a Bills game it's that evening.

Mr. Rund - I appreciate it. I'm just trying to do my best to be a good business.

Chairman Logan - Sure. No, we appreciate it and understand your position. So I think as far as the lighting goes, I don't think you see an objection to, from the board for a few nights. As long as you're not all night overnight.

Mr. Gallina - I think it's more important it ties to the hours of operation, right?

Mr. Rund - On that note, you know, we used to stay open to one o'clock all the time and judging, looking at the financials and just kind of how society has changed a little bit. We close at 11 o'clock Monday through Thursday, 10 o'clock on Sundays because it just didn't make sense to run the labor and the pay and the energy and etc. I guess one thing that I'd like to add is that there was an incident, there was a police incident where someone got hurt at the hotel not too far from us, I believe, behind Chili's. I think someone was robbed. And so I really like it for my staff to be able to, it does give us a little more light around the building and we have cameras and the police have done great. Whenever we've had an issue, they've been right there. I can set it on a timer, but I would love to make sure that it's at least on, you know, until my staff has to exited the building just for a little extra.

Mr. Limbeck - Are the white lights on all night?

Mr. Rund - Oh, well, right now they're on a timer with the timer of the parking lot lights. We've always kept them on until the light comes on. We got burglarized probably 20 years ago now. They were sitting on top of the back side of that road and they waited till we left and then they came down. So, my father and I have always just wanted the lights on so that if someone leaves their car there too, overnight, we want to make sure that no one is damaging any property that someone might have made the right decision and left their car there. I don't know how you guys feel about that, but I certainly they wouldn't be on all the time, but just while the parking lot lights were on.

Chairman Logan - I guess I would say we certainly give you leeway for security lighting. We'll call it after hours. What do you think? Are you like an hour later than when you close.

Mr. Rund - I can turn those off. I have the app on my phone. I can turn off from wherever I am. I can set a timer for it. I guess I wouldn't mind leaving them on just because I think the building looks really good with the parking lot lights on. But if it is an issue, I have no problem shutting it off like an hour after we close. Whatever you guys recommend.

Chairman Logan - Yeah, that's the last person out close, turns the lights off. Except for whatever security lighting you feel you need. Whether it's right along the building or in a spot of the parking area. I don't know how much control you have over all those other lights.

Ms. Turner - Is three days enough for some of the holidays? Like for St. Patrick's Day? I know sometimes some restaurants are serving all week long. They're kind of celebrating certain weeks

that you feel like three days may be limiting if you have like menu items that are tying in with that holiday and you're trying to keep the spirit up.

Mr. Rund - I guess I didn't really have a plan until we got notified that we were doing something wrong. So, then I started thinking about, and honestly, in the 20 plus years that we've been there, we've been a huge supporter of many of the sports teams at the school. And so one thing I guess now that I think about it, we've done like blue and yellow for the football games for the football team and, and just try to be festive within the town. I would love a week, if that's okay. I mean, I can promise you I won't make it look uglier or whatever. I won't abuse the power. I would love a week, but certain things like Valentine's Day is kind of like a onetime shot type thing or Halloween, we did purple. That's kind of a onetime thing. I guess I didn't think about it to get any more than a couple days, but I appreciate whatever.

Mr. Gallina - So how about Joe, maybe for the decorative lighting to support a holiday not to exceed one week.

Ms. Turner - That gives you the flexibility for, you know.

Mr. Rund -I appreciate it very much.

Chairman Logan - Like I said, I don't think the board objects to what you're trying to do. And you know, I hate to put arbitrary restrictions on your business when you're keeping up the spirit and doing other things that very much appreciate it.

Ms. Turner - I love the way that you're selling. You're celebrating our schools, you know, sports teams, and that's. I think that's important as well. Keeping the spirit up in the community.

Mr. Rund - Okay, so should I talk about the next thing? So the next thing was. So, the storage units that we have in the corner of the property, which I should fully disclose, they became more visible when we decided to rip all the phragmites that was overtaking my property and my neighbor's property. Excited to get that under control because that's, I don't know if you ever saw the Money Pit, but that is our Money Pit. So, you know, didn't realize, I guess, at the time because we thought that they were temporary, that we wouldn't need a permit to do this. And. And when we had put them in during COVID that was as you guys can remember, that was kind of a wild time. So it was something that we had laid crusher stone to keep those flat. And inside, those containers are really just equipment. Extra storage for patio furniture, which obviously we had a lot more than what we had originally had. Also, seasonal stuff like salt, rather than buying a couple bags, it's cheaper to buy a pallet. And sometimes if I don't get through the pallet, we carry it over to the next year. Unfortunately, our driveway is pitched just enough where, thankfully, my father is our plow guy, because sometimes he's up there four or five times a day because we don't want someone to slide out onto 96. So it's a little bit of a challenge for us at times, but most of it is just equipment that we just don't have room inside of our building when we expanded our business.

Chairman Logan - So these are rental units, right?

Mr. Rund - We bought them.

Chairman Logan - My question is it permanent? Because it sounds like you need them.

Mr. Rund - I mean, that's the tough thing because, I guess, and with all due respect, I mean, didn't know what made them different than, like, the E Waste with all the tractor trailers on their property. If I just put wheels on these, then they're mobile and I don't know. I guess this whole thing started because I had these lights flickering and then Codes came up and they started dinging us for all these things that I didn't realize that we were in violation of. So I took the sign out of my window, which was one of the things I put in an application for these lights. And when it comes to these containers, as you can see in the one photo from down from the road, we could go to that photo, they're hard to see. And from the road picture, maybe when it gets there, you'll see when we took out the. So, when we took out all the phragmite over here, we thought about building this berm up just a little bit higher. We were concerned about the depth of this pond, but when we cleaned it up and we got a clear day and the dust settled, we realized that it's only about a foot and a half deep.

So, it's very, very shallow, which is good. The plan is to do some kind of overflow. I forget the name of the rock, but I've talked to the landscapers of getting the water to be able to go to the storm drain, which is located somewhere down here, to keep that water at bay so that these, this aggressive phragmite doesn't keep growing up.

And it really, unfortunately for Sue when she bought the property, John, our neighbor to the right of us, he wasn't doing well health wise and he just couldn't keep up with the property. And, we could only do so much. So, it just kept growing and growing. And it's such an aggressive species that we have to get onto like this spray program to keep it at bay. And then once we're complete the spray program, we should be good. We're going to plant grass. All this will be all grass. And I thought about, we found some boulders within the mess that was found. So, we kind of thought of kind of decorating it with the boulders, just obviously to make sure cars knew not to drive there. But my thought was that if I depending on what you guys recommend, I mean, obviously I, I don't want to have to spend money on offensive. I don't have to because that's a lot of money. That's not really going to return any investment for us. I'd be happy to paint them. I was thinking maybe black to match the pillars of the building. But I also didn't know if there was an option to build this berm up a little bit more so that you wouldn't see it at all. But I really just didn't know kind of how you guys felt about the situation. So kind of wanted to put this site plan in and just come and talk to you guys and see what you guys recommend.

Mr. Harter - I don't have a question. I think I have a comment which is, I think those aren't temporary any longer. They're permanent, right?

Mr. Rund - I mean, for now.

Mr. Harter - It's pretty much like an accessory structure. So I think we kind of have to look at it that way.

Chairman Logan - So do you have any comment about the color or the, because right now you have dumpsters as well that are not in an enclosure of any sort, which normally we would require

that, which would be pretty much like a fence or something that would be more architecturally fitting with the building or the appearance there. And that's pretty wide open. Not from the road, but on site. How do you access those? I mean, the trucks just drive right up.

Mr. Rund - So I guess if maybe we could go to that first layout of the overall layout of the whole property. So, when we had these in the past, we had them located here, but unfortunately we were a popular restaurant on fish fry Fridays and the fish doesn't smell very good on July night on the patio. So, we were forced to move those dumpsters over to this way over here. So usually when the trucks come in, they come right through here. They're there at 6 in the morning, they pick up here, back up and they're in their radar. It's kind of out of everybody's way. I totally appreciate and respect everything you guys do. I didn't know how this was going to go when it came to the dumpsters. And obviously my neighbors have dumpsters that are exposed. I mean, one particular is Pace window. The Pace windows has that dumpster roll off that's very visible to the road. And so I just ask politely that you be fair. I mean, I would put a fence if I had to. I guess I would also maybe consider moving them back over here behind where they can't be visible. I've driven around the town a lot prior to this meeting because I just wanted to do my research and see what other people had around here. I know there's a lot of dumpsters that are visible from the road. So, I just, I don't know where the line is drawn and how that works.

Chairman Logan - But can they be put on the. I don't know. Was that north side of those on the other side, you know, the opposite side.

Mr. Rund - No, unfortunately, we've really maximized the ability of this property. We during COVID and to get approval from the town. When we did the patio, we ended up putting in a, I think it's like an 8-or 10-foot, 120 foot retaining wall back here because all the land was actually pushing the containers towards the building. So, we spent a ton of money and we created nine permanent spots on the backside of this property for the employees because we had lost approximately 10 or 11. Don't quote me on that, but we had lost 10 or 11, 12 over here because it was a double lane when. When we had put the patio in. So we really can't dig into that hill any. Any more than what we have.

Chairman Logan - Well, I guess my thought was you have two dumpsters here or containers. And could you slide one container down and make. Put the dumpsters in between them or slide both of them down and put the dumpsters on the other side?

Mr. Rund - Maybe it's something that we could look at for sure. I think access for these trucks to get to them would probably be the most important thing that we'd have to.

Chairman Logan - I mean can they come in since there's nobody going to be there when they come in to pick up trash from the dumpsters? Correct. Early in the morning or whatever. So that they could come in here and pick up stuff here if these two were slid down another 10ft or whatever.

Mr. Rund - I guess my only concern is that. And I wish this was a problem that I had more often, but you know, parking is thankfully a lot of people take Uber and that the Uber and Lyft and all that has changed us so much now. But when we do have events like for instance, the turtle races,

which is a very popular event that we have for charity, we need almost every spot that we can get. I guess what I'd be willing to sacrifice is I'd be willing to put a fence around the dumpsters because that would block a portion of the container anyways. But I really don't want to have to move those containers because I just don't want to lose parking spots and I and I know probably doesn't want me to either.

Chairman Logan - Well, Susie, if you can go to the next couple of pictures. The next ones perhaps. If the dumpsters are here, how are there people actually parking behind that?

Mr. Rund - So you can see where this car is right here. That's really the last spot.

Chairman Logan - So if this dumpster slid or not dumpster, container slid over into that spot and you put the dumpsters either in between, or you slid both of them over and put the dumpsters here. You're not taking away any parking spaces, and you're still using the pavement that you've got up to that point. And you've hidden the dumpsters and maybe blocked smell from another part of the building. If he would look at that. I guess that's my thing. Rather than spend money on fencing and all that kind of stuff.

Mr. Rund - No, I appreciate that.

Chairman Logan - You could slide it over and if you want to darken up, paint on the containers, for instance, that might be another way to make them blend in. If you make them black, they're just going to get really hot. So, I don't know if that's a good idea. But I'm throwing things out. I'd be interested in hearing the board's comments as well. So, Joe, questions.

Mr. Limbeck - I think that that's a possibility. Instead of painting it black, get the kids from school to put a mural up on the storage units.

Mr. Rund - Someone did recommend that to me. I've thought about doing some kind of mural of the town or like a kind of a cool map. I know we've been a part of some. Some charity apparel and. And have been happy to help donate to raise money for. I believe it was Tyler Strong at the time. But there's definitely some ideas that I have to make them look a little more attractive.

Chairman Logan - Tasteful, changeable murals. I mean, you could have the football team up there, whatever. So that's not a bad.

Mr. Limbeck - The only issue I've got with your suggestion is I don't know if you can move the storage units far enough apart to get the two dumpster side by side.

Chairman Logan - My thought really is move them both over and put the dumpsters on the backside right in here. So that thing's eight feet wide probably. I don't know how wide these

dumpsters are. Maybe that's a problem. Wes is showing the actual street view of the two dumpsters.

Mr. Limbeck - The fellow that comes in to empty the dumpsters, then is going to have to back all the way in there to get access to the.

Chairman Logan - No, he would just drive in and back up and get it. Or he drives straight in and picks it up over the top. I don't know.

Mr. Limbeck - It's worth looking at for sure.

Chairman Logan - Regarding visibility, I guess. I don't know. Al. Questions?

Mr. Gallina - Well, so certainly, I certainly want to see the business be successful. No issue about that. And you know, money is money. But if this was a new site plan approval, we would more than likely require some type of shielding, enclosure, landscaping. And so I just want to make sure that we're consistent from that perspective.

Chairman Logan - I mean it's a preexisting condition in a way.

Mr. Gallina - It's only pre existing because we didn't know they were there and they were hidden with other landscaping, I guess.

Chairman Logan - I don't know if there were ever dumpsters in the original building plan or something.

Mr. Gallina - Not just the dumpsters, but the temporary storage.

Chairman Logan - Storage containers are another issue. But I mean, it's like a shed, you know, it's not a thousand square feet, I don't think between the two of them.

Mr. Rund - I don't know what the square footage is. I think they're 40ft each.

Chairman Logan - 3 to 720ft square feet. So that's less than a thousand between the two of them.

Mr. Gallina - But again, I just would challenge ourselves if another restaurant was moving in and they said, hey, we're going to put some containers out there. They probably would say, well, you're going to need to do something to remedy that.

Mr. Rund - So I guess I do have one question about that. And I totally understand what you're what and what you're saying. And I'm not looking for any special treatment. When you, when you drive on 96 and you turn into the mall, right behind the Target is the same container that I have with a sign on it that says Rent me. I've been, like I said, I've been here for 20 plus years. That thing has to have been there for a decade. How is that different? Because that's way more

visible than what we have. And there's a sign on it that says Rent Me. Right on it. Right behind Target. I'm willing to do whatever you guys want me to do. How will other places have to do that? Because I'm having to do it.

Chairman Logan - We typically address them as they come up. I don't think we're proactive about running around the town saying you don't have a conclusion, whatever.

Mr. Pettee - I think it's a fair and I'd like to chime in just a little bit. I can certainly appreciate your observations. Especially with what you just cited in terms of what you've. You're seeing in other parts of the town and this board right now, obviously we're looking at your application, so I don't think we're prepared to be able to say, oh, well, the town's going to go enforce this elsewhere. So we just want to deal with. With this particular application that we have in front of us. And so I guess I probably wouldn't speculate on how the town's going to address other situations that you're observing. If I were a concerned resident and I had these observations, I might go to the planning and building offices and say, you know, hey, what, you called this out on my property. How is this being dealt with elsewhere?

Chairman Logan - If you can't make it work where it might fit on the other side, if you can rearrange what you have out there suitably for you, your operations, then I would suggest that a fence around it might be the most consistent with what else is being done on new applications before the town. That way they can be somewhat separated or segregated from parking and visible flavor of the community, I guess. I don't think a berm in the front of the building would count as a dumpster enclosure unless it was right around there. So I think you're kind of forced to address it where you want to actually put the. Put the dumpsters if you're leaving them there, if you can move them. So, I would say they're a good block view of the view shed if the dumpsters are on the other side.

Mr. Rund - No, I understand. So, I guess for clarification, or just an additional question, if I were to do a fence that came out from right here and went in front of them and then closed off here so that basically almost 50% of that container would be covered. Additionally, with the berm and the new landscaping, that will hopefully obviously hide it a little bit better. Would that be adequate? Or do I have to have a fence and then another fence around?

Chairman Logan - No, you can go three, you know, two sides right up against the container. The container is a wall itself. Maybe they're, what, 6ft high, 8ft high, something like that? No, the. T If the dumpsters are 8ft high, just match it. Or 6ft high or whatever.

Mr. Rund - It is pretty standard to what's around town with Newville.

Chairman Logan - And if you have fencing on the other part of the property that's you could complement or whatever. Maybe not the temporary orange barriers that you have, but actual fencing. I don't see any, but Wes is going through Google Street View.

Mr. Rund - I guess a comment on the orange fencing. We're doing our best to try and figure out what the right thing to do is. We've had people sideswipe rocks take out fences. We can't seem to

find the right piece that will keep them safe and off the property. So we're using them for now and then, you know, going to look at and see what the best option is for that.

Chairman Logan - My comment was so you just don't add to it. I understand what you're doing. Certainly, don't want people bumping into everybody's cars or across the grass or whatever else is going on over there. So anybody else?

Ms. Turner - I would just maybe consider if you're going to put a fence enclosure around it just to move it over a little bit to the left. Because I would worry about opening of the fence hitting into cars. You know what I'm saying? Because that's what you're going to need to have a wide enough gate. So that when they come to remove the garbage, they can easily lift and remove the garbage. So, you can't obviously just have like a small little gate. You would have to be a big door. And so I would just be cognizant of that with cars being so close.

Chairman Logan - On the plus side, there won't be any cars there when they come pick up the dump, the empty the dumpsters at six in the morning or eight.

Ms. Turner - They come that early.

Mr. Rund - They do. And you know what we could do is we do seal the lot every year. So maybe what I could do there isn't a, like, I won't call it an auxiliary spot, but like in years past, we've either kept our plow truck there or the plow there or other stuff there. We could do kind of this, this striped line here, do it there so that we never have to worry about anyone parking there. Traditionally, anyone parking over here is either not trained to be found by their spouse or one of our employees. So, it just seems to be an area that people are hiding over there. And I'm probably not helping them that I took the phragmite away. But like that's our staff usually parks over on this side because we do have more than nine people behind the building at times. But I will do the next time we seal which is every year. We could do something like that to protect that.

Chairman Logan - I think the conclusion on this discussion is some fencing with gates. And that it can abut the dumps the containers. And we can move on. What was the last one?

Mr. Harter - Do we want a drawing or something showing specifically what. I think we should proposed probably have to pay attention to a fire lane. I would think too around there. That separation needs to be.

Mr. Rund - Sure not a problem. I mean the good news is on that side. Maybe if you could go back to the layout of the whole property there. When we did this patio, we were looking to see if we could get a row in here because it is so wide. So the good news is that there is quite a bit of room to get through over here. Well, I'll definitely make sure that when we submit that that's, you know, thought of.

Chairman Logan - We'll want to see what you intend to do there. What materials you're going to propose. Fencing and gates and stuff like that.

Ms. Boughton - So, I can definitely move you to the end of January or if you need more time, February whenever you get the plan in.

Mr. Rund - With that being proposed. So let's say I work with a couple different companies. I get the quotes. Obviously with the ground being frozen, is there like can I have time to put this in in April when it warms up or.

Chairman Logan - I don't see why not. Whatever works in your timing. I think it's a reasonable request to be put on and get the work done in the spring when the ground is more manageable. Was there anything else. There were three things. The containers, the lighting. I don't think we can have a resolution of any sort here. I think we'll see you when you've got the updated plans and other information we need. You might want to think about your schedule of lighting. If you want to list it all out. Your ideas and thoughts. We can keep it open and flexible enough.

I Think that you could add if you needed to in the future that come before the board again, unless it was some major event. I'm going to say this is a public hearing, but unless anybody has an objection, I think don't think we need to keep it open.

The Board was okay with closing the public hearing.

On motion of Joe Limbeck, seconded by Trisha Turner, RESOLVED, that the public hearing was closed.

Chairman Logan - Your choice on when you want to come back. But as long as you got enough time to do it, you certainly got till the spring to get the work done.

GOOD LIFE COLLECTIVE

1020 Eastview Mall Drive

Owner – Eastview Mall LLC

Tax Map # 6.00-1-12.100

Applicant is requesting approval to establish a licensed adult-use cannabis retail dispensary for an in-line store at Eastview Mall.

33-SP-2025 100-
Zoned – Commercial

Chairman Logan – This application has been removed until next meeting.

LEHIGH PLACE PDD PRELIM & FINAL SUBDIVISION

200 Victor Height Parkway

Owner – Auburn Trail Properties LLC

Tax Map # 15.00-2-14.210

Applicant is requesting approval to subdivide the 24.154 parcel into three lots. Lot 1 will consist of the FLCC building on 6.654 acres, Lot 2 is the proposed apartment buildings on

03-PS-2025, 03-FS-2025
Zoned – PDD

14.202 acres and Lot 3 will consist of the TLC Daycare on 3.298 acres. This is the second and third step of a major subdivision.

Chairman Logan – This application has been removed until a further meeting.

LEHIGH PLACE PDD SITE PLAN

31-SP-2025

200 Victor Height Parkway

Zoned – PDD

Owner – Auburn Trail Properties LLC

Tax Map # 15.00-2-14.210

Applicant is requesting approval to construct three 4 story apartment buildings consisting of 52 units in each for a total of 156 multi-family units. It will consist of a clubhouse and pool, grill area, dog park and open and covered parking areas.

Chairman Logan – This application has been removed until a further meeting.

ELEMENT by WESTIN at EASTVIEW MALL

33-SP-2024

100-1020 Eastview Mall Drive

Zoned – Commercial

Owner – Eastview Mall LLC

Tax Map # 6.00-1-12.100

Applicant is requesting approval to develop a new 4-story 23,580 sf hotel with 123 rooms on 91.4-acre parcel. It is located on the west side of the mall property on a existing paved parking lot between JC Penny and the former Lord and Taylor.

Peter Vars with BME Associates on behalf of the applicant East View Hospitality Group.

Mr. Vars - We're back after our appearance back on November 12th. And at that time this board tabled the application as it relates to resolution of the issue regarding the reconstruction of Pump Station PS19. Since that time, we did meet with the town to discuss the reconstruction. And right now the owner and the applicant are in discussions with the Town of Victor at the Town Board level as it relates to the contribution to the reconstruction. The applicant and owner acknowledged the need to reconstruct PS19. And as I mentioned we're just discussing what is the cost sharing with that. It was our understanding that the town would be prepared to proceed with a SEQRA determination that it would be a conditional neg deck based on the fact of the condition being that there'd be resolution on the reconstruction of PS19. Such that then it allow the applicant to proceed with their discussions and agreements with the Marriott Corporation and then also allow us to come back and wrap up the site plan review. So that's kind of where we are two months since the last time we were here and I guess I'll just see if the resolution's ready.

Mr. Pettee - So what I've prepared tonight is a draft resolution for conditional neg dec resolution. I'm happy to hand this out. And in going through parts two and three of the long form right there is. There was simply one question.

One question that was raised to a moderate to large impact where there would potentially be a significant adverse environmental impact. And that was in question number 17, consistency with

community plans subparagraph E. The proposed action may cause a change in the density of development that is not supported by existing infrastructure or is distant from existing infrastructure. Peter, why don't I give you a copy of this, too, this draft resolution.

In order to issue a condition neg dec resolution, you've got to have a long form EAF, which the applicant has provided. You've got to do lead agency coordination, which has been completed. Not each of the involved agencies responded, but 30 days has passed. So that expiration date has gone by where another potentially involved agency, you know, had the opportunity to express interest in being lead agency. So none of that has transpired. The agencies that did respond all indicated that they don't have a problem with the planning board being seeker lead agency. And if you want to move forward with this resolution, if you want me to read it or Joe, feel free to read it yourself. I think it's worthy of going through, though.

Mr. Limbeck - Wes, can you clarify that point about the infrastructure? Is that relative to the pump station.

Mr. Pettee - So in reviewing the project, reviewing the engineer's report, and we've taken a look at the calculations and the Pump Station 19, which is in between the movie theater and the L.L. bean retail store, that doesn't have sufficient capacity to handle the peak flows of the hotel. So there have been instances, as most recently Black Friday, we've been doing some monitoring of flows in that area, and we noticed on Black Friday that there was a. The flow is 349, basically 350 gallons per minute. The station was designed, or its optimal capacity is 370 gallons per minute, peak flow. But given the age of the pump station and the wear and tear that has occurred over the years on that pump station, that efficiency just isn't there. And you're probably at a maximum capacity right now of 350 gallons per minute. And we reached that on Black Friday this year. So, any additional flows, I think, would overwhelm Pump Station 19. And that's what this resolution is saying. And it articulates a condition that would need to be met in order for that neg dec.

Mr. Limbeck - Right now being a potential major checkbox on the form is just temporary because the discussions that the applicant and the town are having relative to pump station should address that capacity issue. Is that the case?

Mr. Pettee - So we're looking for the developer to contribute toward the cost of replacing that pump station. And the reason why is because as of last year when this application was filed, that pump station was not on the town's capital five-year capital plan to replace. We knew at some point it needed to be replaced because it is aging. It's nearing the end of its life cycle. But there are other priorities in the town. Sanitary sewer system that need to be addressed as well. And because they're advancing that the project is advancing the need for the town to replace the pump station, the town is asking for participation in the cost. So that's where the town board and the developer are in negotiations as to what that number might be.

Mr. Limbeck - So I think I'm good. Thank you.

Chairman Logan - Wes, just to clarify, what facilities does PS19 serve? Is it the entire mall or a portion of it?

Mr. Pettee - A pretty big chunk of the malls, my understanding. Pump Station 19 serves also. There is a private pump station that collects wastewater from the Home Depot area. The Target

area. That sends its flows right up to that Pump Station 19 conveys its flow to Pump Station 18, which is behind the New York Beer project. And so there is some development in the Eastview Mall area towards Route 96 that does not discharge to pump station 19. It gravities towards pump station 18.

Chairman Logan - Chick fil A will be 18, correct?

Mr. Pettee - Chick Fil a will not discharge flows to Pump Station 19.

Mr. Limbeck - So I've got one more question now with Bass Pro going in your study from Black Friday had a vacant Lord and Taylor property. Will the addition of a Bass Pro change the calculations again? It'll worsen things if anything, Right?

Mr. Pettee - It may. So, yes, Lord and Taylor is vacant. There may be some flows from bathrooms in a retail store, but I don't anticipate a whole lot more being discharged.

Chairman Logan read the draft resolution.

DECISION:

On motion of Scott Harter, seconded by Joe Limbeck:

WHEREAS, a site plan application (the "Application") was received on or about December 10 2024 by the Secretary of the Town of Victor Planning Board entitled Element by Westin at Eastview (the "Project"), submitted by BME Associates, on behalf of EVHDC1 LLC (the "Applicant") for the property located at 100-1020 Eastview Mall Drive in the Town of Victor (the "Site"); and,

WHEREAS, the Applicant is requesting site plan approval to construct the Project that consists of a 4-story hotel with 123 rooms over a +/-23,580 square foot footprint on Lot R-6 of the Eastview Mall property (tax map no. 6.00-01-12.1), where said Project is more fully described in the Applicant's December 10, 2024 cover letter, site plan drawing set prepared by BME Associates, last revised February 18, 2025, Full Environmental Assessment Form (the "FEAF") dated November 17, 2025, and other submissions that are on file with the Town of Victor; and,

WHEREAS, the Project parcel is located in the Town's Commercial Center (CC) Zoning District, Route 96/251 Corridor Overlay District, and Eastview Mall Mixed Use Overlay District; and,

WHEREAS, the Town of Victor Planning Board (the “Planning Board”) is authorized to undertake site plan review and decide upon site plan applications pursuant to Section 211-9 of the Town of Victor Town Code (the “Code”); and,

WHEREAS, the State Environmental Quality Review Act (ECL Article 8 and its implementing regulations at 6 NYCRR Part 617, collectively “SEQRA”) require that no agency shall carry out, fund or approve an action until it has complied with the requirements of SEQRA;

WHEREAS, in order to aid the Planning Board in determining whether the Project and site plan approval, development, construction and other approvals or activities in connection therewith (“Action”) may have a significant effect on the environment, as provided and described in SEQRA, the Planning Board has caused to be prepared a Full Environmental Assessment Form (“FEAF”); and,

WHEREAS, the Planning Board hereby confirms that the Project is an Unlisted Action pursuant to SEQRA, and caused Town Staff to initiate a Lead Agency coordination process for the Unlisted Action and notified all potentially involved and interested agencies of the Project by transmitting a lead agency coordination package on November 17, 2025, that included Part I of the FEAF, cover letter and a lead agency sign off form; and,

WHEREAS, the Ontario County Planning Board, Town of Farmington, and Town Board of the Town of Victor responded to the Lead Agency Coordination transmittal on November 20, 2025, November 21, 2025, and November 26, 2025, respectively; each indicating their agency had no objection to the Planning Board being lead agency; and,

WHEREAS, no other involved agencies have expressed their intent or desire to be lead agency, and at least 30 calendar days have passed since the Planning Board staff transmitted the lead agency coordination package to all potentially involved and interested agencies; and,

WHEREAS, the Project anticipates generating 14,390 gallons of wastewater per day, as identified in the Applicant’s Engineering Report and Part 1 EAF. Sanitary flows would be conveyed by an 8-inch gravity main to an existing privately owned pump station located on Lot 2 at the northwest corner of the intersection of Eastview Mall Drive and Commons Boulevard. The privately owned pump station would then pump wastewater to the Town’s pump station 19 (“PS-19”) located at the northeast corner of Tax Map No. 6.00-1-12.500, in the area between the existing movie theater and L.L. Bean retail store. From PS-19, wastewater is then conveyed through a series of pump stations, gravity mains and force mains to the Town of Farmington wastewater treatment plant located within the Town of Victor on McMahon Road; and,

WHEREAS, the portion of the Town of Victor sanitary sewer system that would serve the Project is operated and maintained by the Town of Farmington pursuant to an intermunicipal agreement first entered into on February 12, 1997, containing several amendments and now has an expiration date of December 31, 2045; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Farmington Code Enforcement Officer issued an e-mail on December 23, 2024, indicating, in part, that “Upgrades to the pump station would need to be done.”; and,

WHEREAS, the Town Engineer, LaBella Associates, has asserted in their January 14, 2025 comment letter and June 26, 2025, comment letter that the Project would cause a need for replacement of PS-19 as projected wastewater flows from the Project would exceed the capacity of PS-19. The existing pump station (PS-19) is rated to accommodate up to 370 gallons per minute at peak flow; however, efficiency of pumping capacity has degraded due to age and operational wear and tear. The Town Engineer has estimated that PS-19’s peak flow capacity is likely in the range of 350 gallons per minute. Recent flow monitoring data from November 28, 2025 (Black Friday) indicate a measured peak flow of 347.5 gallons per minute. As the Project’s peak hourly flow is 42 gallons per minute, the anticipated wastewater flow from the Project would exceed the capacity of PS-19.

WHEREAS, the Planning Board, as Lead Agency, has carefully reviewed and considered Part 1 of the Long Environmental Assessment Form, application materials, public comments and environmental record concerning the Project, as well as completed the applicable Parts 2 and 3 of the FEAF, and has carefully reviewed and considered comments provided by various consulting entities including the Town Engineer, LaBella Associates, and the Town of Farmington Water and Sewer Department, and identified a significant adverse impact to the Town’s sanitary sewer conveyance system, specifically, PS-19; and,

WHEREAS, replacement of PS-19 is not identified on the Town’s 5-year capital plan for replacement and the anticipated Project would accelerate the Town’s expenditures for PS-19 replacement, and the Town Engineer has prepared an opinion of probable project cost for replacement of PS-19 that would accommodate existing wastewater flows as well as wastewater flows from the Project, where said opinion of probable project cost is \$1.29 Million; and

WHEREAS, Engineering and related costs, as well as legal costs associated with PS-19 replacement are expected to be \$195,200, as described in a LaBella letter to the Town’s Project Manager, dated July 3, 2025, as well as a supplemental LaBella memorandum to the Town’s Project Manager, dated August 8, 2025; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Victor Town Board (the “Town Board”) is currently negotiating with the Applicant to participate in sharing costs associated with replacement of PS-19, but an agreement between the Town Board and the Applicant has not yet been reached.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town of Victor Planning Board hereby affirms its status as Lead Agency; and be it further

RESOLVED that a potential significant adverse environmental impact was identified with the proposed Project using the criteria for determining significance identified in 6 NYCRR §

617.7(c)(1) and in accordance with 6 NYCRR § 617.7(c)(2) and (3), namely that the Town's sanitary sewer infrastructure, PS-19, does not have the capacity to accept wastewater flows from the Project; however, the Planning Board hereby finds and concludes that the proposed Action and Project could eliminate and avoid the potential significant adverse environmental impact provided the following condition is met:

- Due to the Project accelerating the Town's expenditures for replacement of PS-19, the Applicant participate in funding a portion of costs associated with PS-19 replacement in an amount and format agreed upon by the Town Board and Town Attorney.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby issues a Conditional Negative Declaration wherein the above mentioned condition must be met; and be it further

RESOLVED, a notice of Conditioned Negative Declaration shall be filed and/or published to the extent required by the SEQRA regulations, and as the Town of Victor Planning Board may deem advisable; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board will accept comments on the Conditioned Negative Declaration until 4:00pm on February 19, 2026, which complies with the minimum 30-day public comment period as required by SEQRA's implementing regulations, where said comment period begins on the date that notice of the conditioned negative declaration is published in the Environmental Notice Bulletin; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board's adoption of the Conditional Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law of the State of New York and implemented under 6 NYCRR Part 617; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board Secretary distribute the Planning Board's SEQRA determination.

This resolution was put to a vote with the following results:

Joe Logan	Aye
Al Gallina	Aye
Scott Harter	Aye
Joe Limbeck	Aye
Trisha Turner	Aye

Approved 5 Ayes, 0 Opposed

Chairman Logan - A lengthy resolution. But are there any comments, questions? So, Wes, any other thoughts before we make a motion for approval of this resolution?

Mr. Pettee - Well, as you saw in the resolution that I wasn't aware of it at first, but the public comment period, the 30-day public comment period actually begins when the notice shows up or is published in the Environmental Notice Bulletin. So this would require that by tomorrow at 2pm we submit. And I can do that for the for the Planning Board. If you so choose to move forward with resolution, I can make that file that notice with the ENB which would show up in

next Wednesday's publication at the end. So that's when the public comment period starts. 30 days.

Chairman Logan - Okay, thanks. I appreciate that clarification. So, with that said, any objection to moving forward with the resolution, in which case I'll ask for a motion for approval of that SEQRA resolution. Peter, we had requested improved photo simulations. And for the next meeting that you guys come forward to us. Can you have that ready?

Mr. Vars - Yes, we would.

Chairman Logan - And then the lighting plan and building elevations would be important to see how much light comes off of those.

Mr. Vars - The simulations of building lighting with parking lot lighting.

Chairman Logan - Actual photo simulations would be certainly desirable.

Mr. Vars - Yes, we understand that.

STEWART TREE SERVICE SITE PLAN

7548 Co Rd 42

Owner – Richard Stewart

Tax Map # 6.00-1-26.110

Applicant is requesting approval to operate a tree service business at this site. Was previously a restaurant

06-SU-2025, 21-SP-2025

Zoned – Light Industrial

Chairman Logan – This application has been removed until a further meeting.

SKETCH APPLICATION

WOODS AT VALENTOWN SECTION 2-4

High Point Drive

Owner – Woods at Valentown LLC

Tax Map # 1.07-1-5.000

Applicant is requesting **acknowledgement of a complete application** to subdivide 71 for-

01-SK-2026

Zoned – PDD

sale townhomes and construct a 4-story apartment building with 100 units on a 56.87 acre parcel. This is the first step of a major subdivision and only acknowledgement of a completed application will be considered at this meeting.

James Cretekos with BME Associates. I'm here on behalf of Commercial Street Partners.

Mr. Cretekos - They're the applicant. I figured what I'll start with is a little background on the project, just kind of as a refresher because this project's been going on since early 2000s now. So like I mentioned, this project kind of started back in the early 2000s. I think the original application we submitted to the town was around 2003. We went through a full DEAI, FEIS for the High Point business Park. This included all three of the office buildings and included the woods of Allentown parcel, which was referred to as the HOA lot at the time. It included High Point Retail phases 1, 2 and 3. So this is what is the North Face lot, what is now where the taco place is, as well as Relax, the spa, and then the Olive Garden and the Starbucks cobblestone building. The woods of Valentown is the last parcel of the PDD to be developed. This, like I mentioned kind of originally as part of the project was composed of townhouses. This being the last phase, it kind of sat for a number of years. And then in approximately 2017, 2018, with the Rinaldi's, we submitted an application to revise the Woods of Valentown parcel to apartments. At the time, I believe the PDD was amended and we had an approved 295 units at the time. It also included the addition of what we were referring to as phase five, which is the kind of the northwest corner of the property. I believe it added this area. It's about five acres approximately.

Chairman Logan - I was going to ask. That's the part that you added or that was added that land to this overall?

Mr. Cretekos - There was like about right here, there was where the lot was before. So, there was always the three stubs into the different sections. So, the overall footprint, the development areas, disturbance are all very consistent. We'll be going through all that with you guys at future meetings. So, what we're doing now is after we went through the 2017, 2018, we did the modifications to the PDD, went through the town board process. We came to you guys, you guys, we went through a SEQR comparison to show you guys how the various land use we'll call green space, impervious areas, disturbance areas, development footprints, water, sewer, basically all the SEQR items. And we showed how we're comparable to the original. And you guys reaffirmed a SEQRA negative declaration. I believe it was April 23rd 3rd, 2019, the same time you guys reissued a site plan approval for the whole site. That was reapproved in 2021. And then in a little bit shortly after that, that's when Commercial Street Partners got involved. Dave, Christa, they acquired ownership of the woods of Allentown property.

And then we came in for you guys for a final approval on section one. At the time, what we had before with the PDD was we had four 21-unit buildings. To make this work a little bit more economically, they kind of mashed those two together. So, we have two 42-unit buildings instead of the four separate ones. This allowed us to make some economies with, you know, shared elevator shafts. The underground parking helps with some economics of that. That project was approved by you guys in July 26, 2022. We lapsed the year on that. We did our two extensions. And so that has now the final approval on that has expired. That application we

resubmitted to you guys about a month ago. We will be on your meeting for that in two weeks. We resubmitted the signed mylars. There are effectively no changes at all to that project. The only things that are going to kind of get updated as part of that is we'll be looking at the bioretention sizing based on the new DEC criteria and the the new filter media, which is a little bit more effective than what it used to be, as well as kind of doing another, I'll call it a supplement to the engineers report from 2019.

Basically, we're going to go through and update the drainage because it's the whole project and give you guys enough information to show that we're still compliant with all the thresholds. Water and sewer usage are going to be a little bit lower because we're dropping down about 39 units with this conversion. So, from the 294 units that were approved with the PDD, the plan now is like I've mentioned, to keep section one the same. So, this will be consistent of 84 units in the clubhouse with the two 42-unit buildings up in section two. This has changed from what was three story buildings down to 31 townhouse lots. Section three. This used to be two three story apartment units with 60 units. This is now going to be a four-story 100-unit apartment building. This is where we're kind of taking some of the density from the northwest and northeast areas and pushing it into the apartment building. And I'll come back to that in a second. And then the phase four area. Now the remainder of the parcel up here in the northwest corner, this is the remaining 40 townhouse lots.

Those are for sale townhouse lots. I don't have it shown here. But basically, what's going to happen is we're going to be making subdivision line right here. So, this will all be an HOA lot with the individual townhouse. For sale lots will be part of an HOA. And then same thing for this corner here. We're going to strike a line through the wooded area here and along the north side of the power line easement and basically make an HOA lot here. Everything else. So all of section one, all of section two, the stormwater bond, the easements, you know, the interior portion that's all wooded and conservation easement, that's all going to be lands to remain that'll be retained by Commercial Street Partners operating the apartment units.

In terms of layout, it's like I said, it's all going to be the exact same. All the road stubs are on High Point Drive were installed working to keep all those exact same layers locations. Water is going to be served by the same methodology as before. We're just going to connect onto the two stubs of the locations and serve public water up through the sites. Now that it's for sale lots, the water authority will take it into dedication so we won't have to do the some of the backflow stuff that had kind of come up a little bit before. So kind of simplified a lot of things for the development end.

Chairman Logan - How much are the roads off the of the stubs are public or dedicated versus private.

Mr. Cretkos - The plan is still to have all the roads be private with access and utility easements to the town for their use. But the HOA is going to end up owning, you know, this whole stub and basically from this intersection up. And then Commercial Street partners will loan basically their little drive, the parking lot as well as everything private down in section one like they were doing before.

Chairman Logan - Okay, so the main spine road is still dedicated.

Mr. Cretekos - High Point Drive is all is dedicated. That's all constructed. We're not planning on basically doing anything in the right of way, storm or sanitary sewers. Same idea. We're just going to basically finish the connection through section one and then basically tie these into these to get served down. And this all goes down to the pump station down by the beer project.

Everything else, office buildings, all this sewer comes down this way. So it's already taken care of. It's separate from what we're looking at here, stormwater, that's already going to be managed by the existing pond that was built here, Storm Management Facility B as well as Stormwater Management Facility A. It's not really shown here, but this is an infiltration basin up at the north end that's been installed and in operation for close to 20 years now without any issues. And we've been doing the annual inspection reports. So, there will be a little bit of expansion to this just to make sure that we can hold the volume in there and get it to infiltrate. Keeping the same kind of ponding, elevations, easements. What we're going to do is the same approach that we plan to do with the last round of approvals.

And I know when Kim Kinsella was here, we had talked extensively about conservation easements, access and utility easements. A lot of the easements from the original HOA lot plan with the townhouses at the time had conservation easements established, access and utility easements established. The plan was basically we're going to wipe them all out and then reestablish everything. Areas are going to be all the same in terms of like conservation easements, but we need to tweak some of the boundaries, get them outside of a building or you know, basically kind of reflusing that all out. So, we'll do easement plans as part of our application, really try and outline exactly what we're doing and help with the comparisons. In terms of green space right now my calc is about 80%. We were about 82% with the last Woods of Valentown approval. So there is about an acre increase, impervious. That's really the factor of taking the three-story apartment units and spreading them out into the the townhouse lot.

Chairman Logan - Houses are one or two stories, the.

Mr. Cretekos - Townhouse lots are two stories. So, I think kind of the biggest change obviously with the project is the apartments in the townhouse. So, the two through four. So, as I mentioned, we're here for section one. Next time we'll go through that, we'll look at the building elevations, clubhouse and we can answer any questions about that. That's not changing. The big changes again, going from the three-story apartments down to a two story townhouse up at the top of the hill. So, visibility is going to be decreasing up here from what it used to be. And then the four-story apartment building. The eve of this building sits about at the finish floor of these buildings. So, this gets very well hidden here behind grade, the wood lines and things like that. So we really don't expect there to be much if any, view of the four-story building from Valentown Road.

Chairman Logan - Were there sections that you guys generated that cut through this to show more.

Mr. Cretekos - So as part of our PDD application to the Town Board, there were a couple cross sections I think. One that went through this way, another one that went toward Valentown. And

those are based on the conceptual elevations. They were all within plus or minus five feet, I think of what we actually ended up with after we graded and tried to balance the site. But those do reflect what's going on and we can bring those next time and go over those, you know, specifically to show how that relationship works for.

Chairman Logan - Both the board and the neighbors.

Mr. Cretekos - We understand that the visibility is kind of the biggest thing, but I think the change in this project actually is a benefit. It will be less visible overall because we're going from the three story up at the top of the hill with the big mass buildings down to a two-story townhouse. So, it'll be a lot more fitting in the context of the site. So, moving forward again, like I said, we'll be here two weeks for reapproval section one. We're planning on submitting section two through four preliminary subdivision application to you guys next week to be on the agenda for the 2nd of February meeting tentatively. Obviously, we'll go through that with you guys. Once we get preliminary approvals, we're going to be looking to basically submit final asap. Our preliminary plans are going to try and basically be final level plans to, to get everything kind of flushed out, water, sewer, any Labella's comments. That way when we move into final, it should be pretty straightforward.

That's kind of the main overview right now. I mean, I'm happy to answer any questions. I can get into some detail if you want now, but obviously we're going to be here several more meetings discussing this.

Chairman Logan - I appreciate the overview. This is not a public hearing is this evening, so we wouldn't be entertaining questions. You'll have plenty of opportunity to do that with future meetings when it comes to preliminary plans because this is just sketch plan review for the board. So our completion. Any questions from the board?

Ms. Turner - I didn't have any questions.

Mr. Harter - I guess my comment would be what you stated is pretty identical to what Peter Vars stated. I think the last time that he was here presenting the project. And I think we mentioned, or at least I mentioned that I recall when the project first went in, doing the balloon test at the top and that sort of thing. It's always been a very highly visible area. And so to Joe's point, you have a visual impact analysis would be really helpful to us I think. I just want to restate that.

Mr. Gallina - Nothing else.

Mr. Limbeck - I support what Scott's saying and I think actually the change from apartment buildings to townhouses I think is going to help in that regard. But I think the test is still appropriate just to. Just to validate that.

Mr. Cretekos - I'm pretty sure we have those balloon studies, heights and even the photos still from when we submitted them before. Before. I mean, they won't be exactly this, but we can say this balloon was flown at this height and this building is going to be this height and kind of show you how it will be hidden from those key views. And I believe we did. I know we flew the balloons on section one here. From the views here, I have a feeling they weren't visible here, if

I'm recalling correctly. And I know the ones over here off Turk Hill were just at the very top of the tree. So, moving them down whatever, 10, 15ft in height is really going to get you below the tree line. So I'm happy to dust those off and bring those in next time.

Mr. Harter - I would also just add, you know, driving down Valentown Road today, for example, in the winter in a leaf off condition, you know, there's a lot you can see in there. And so when I

look at those buildings that are close to Valentown Road, and I agree with the other ones that you're talking about, I think that's the most sensitive area in terms of a visual impact.

Mr. Cretekos - Section one here. And that was something that we obviously went through with the board extensively when we did section one approvals. And that's why we're not proposing any changes to that. So that way we can leave everything exactly the same. But I'm happy to get the, the balloon studies and pictures for those out too. So you can kind of see how those. And those are all very consistent.

Mr. Harter - I think we'd still like to see that.

Mr. Pettee - James, could you describe, with regard to the townhouses, the northwest area, could you describe how that has been modified? Your sketch has been modified compared to the previous apartments in relation to the Rueda residence that's next door?

Mr. Cretekos - So the Rueda residence is this parcel right here. They've got like a long private driveway that comes up at like 10 to 15%. And then they have their, I believe a sideload garage of their rear yard facing to the east. So one of the things that we did when we made this change, this used to be, I believe it was two 30-unit buildings or 3-21 unit buildings I think is what we ended up with. So we had one building here and then two kind of on this northern property line with or I'm sorry, we had the drive on the northern property line and two here with the rears facing south. So now what we've done with this even took modified the PDD application a tiny bit. We tweaked these last two buildings and rotated these so that way there's a side, just one unit here facing the way of residence. It also allows us to walk these two buildings out to grade. So we have full walkouts on the back to basically fit in with the context of the slope as opposed to trying to build a 20 plus foot retaining wall to hold the buildings. And then we also have these two other buildings here. This is area that was, we had just like a bioretention area in here. This is kind of where we've expanded some of this. So, we will have some rears of these eight units here that will be up to the, the property line. We're going to comply obviously with the 50-foot setback to the lot and then we'll have another 20 feet to the building. So, we've got about 70ft from property line to the building on those locations which is well above what you know, normal residential to residential screening is. And obviously with the reduction from the larger mast apartment buildings down to these, we feel it's appropriate. And you know, if there was any other residential to residential property that would be more than adequate for the town.

Mr. Pettee – Do I understand correctly then maybe there's some residential buildings that are a little bit closer to the property line than previous, the previous design. But you're complying with your setback requirements.

Mr. Cretekos - So it's basically these two buildings right here, the ones that end up getting a little bit closer because they weren't effectively there before. It was one building here and then another building here. And we can do an overlay exhibit if you guys would like just to kind of show the outlines of the buildings before versus what we're looking at now.

Chairman Logan - If you could give us a sense of the tree line. That's just the tree line, but the density of larger trees in that portion to see what you can save for additional screening or not

additional, but to say has save as much screening as you can behind these two townhouses and perhaps over here as well.

Mr. Cretekos - I mean there is. I don't know the density of the trees out here because I haven't walked this in a number of years now. But there are quite a bit of vegetation too on the neighboring property as well. And if we needed to supplement with something to block, you know, low stuff, I'm sure we can talk to Commercial Street about if we need to do like a privacy fence or some screening supplemental stuff there.

Chairman Logan - Natural as possible, I think is always good.

Mr. Cretekos - But the way we tried to configure this is, you know, with the rear, those little lots here, there shouldn't be any headlights going into their backyard. And at the end of this drive here we'll obviously do enough screening here to prevent any sort of headlights from those couple units that would be driving down that little portion of that drive.

Chairman Logan - So parking is all at grade in front of the buildings.

Mr. Cretekos - They'll have garages. They should be able to fit one to two cars in there. And they'll have another space for one to two cars in the driveway. And then we have some visitor spaces. Basically, everything on here, apartments and townhouses, is providing at least two parking spaces per unit.

Chairman Logan - Anything else from anyone?

Ms. Turner - Just more clarification on the parking. So as I'm looking on one of the sketch plans, it looks like. So, you're saying that there's parking in the garage plus there's parking before the garage.

Mr. Cretekos - Correct. So, each of the townhouse units, they all have a garage and then they have. The driveway is 25ft long.

Ms. Turner - So two cars in the driveway and then the. There's like, looks like for every eight units, there's an overflow of two parking spots for lake company coming in. Okay, so you could fit at least two cars in each outside driveway as well.

Mr. Cretekos - I mean realistically you can fit three to four vehicles in the townhouse. The apartment units. These are exactly at two parking spaces for per unit. I believe it's one unit or one parking space that's in each of like the, the sub level garages. These all have drive in parking.

The 104 story, 100 unit building and these larger buildings, we're maintaining that ability for them to have covered parking.

Ms. Turner - And then the apartment building would have. That's what looks like an open parking lot.

Mr. Cretekos - You'll have an open surface lot with you know, say approximately 100 spots and then a. And a garage floor parking. So, there's four stories of apartment units and then there's a basement with a drive in garage you can get. That's what this little drive in at the end is here. Now obviously this will look be a lot more clear once we get plans in with everything.

Chairman Logan - Could you compare it to the apartments on School Street? They have ground level parking and four stories of apartments up above.

Mr. Cretekos - Our first floor is at gray with four stories up. You see four stories exposed on this southeastern face. You will see five stories exposed on the west face where it butts up to the wetland. Just so that way we can open up windows to the garage. It helps with a lot of fire codes. Some of the fire marshal also appreciates.

Chairman Logan - Unless there's an objection, we have a resolution for sketch plan approval.
Completion of completed sketch plan

Chairman Logan read the draft resolution.

DECISION:

On motion of Al Gallina, seconded by Trisha Turner:

WHEREAS, the Planning Board made the following findings of fact:

1. A sketch plan application consisting of, but not limited to a letter of intent, sketch plan application forms, sketch plan drawing set, and aerial photograph were received on December 30, 2025, from Commercial Street Partners, LLC, (the "Applicant") by the Secretary of the Planning Board for a Major Subdivision entitled Woods at Valentown Subdivision (the "Project") for the property located on High Point Drive, Victor, NY;
2. It is the intent of the Project to subdivide 71 for-sale townhomes and construct a 4-story apartment building with 100 units, two 42 unit 3-story buildings and a clubhouse on a 56.87-acre parcel.
3. This An "Under Review" sign was posted on the subject parcel as required by Town Code.
4. The Codes Department reviewed the sketch plan on January 8, 2026, and provided comments.

5. The Landscape Consultant reviewed the sketch plan on January 12, 2026, and provided comments.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that regarding the sketch plan application of Commercial Street Partners, LLC , Major Subdivision entitled Woods at Valentown Subdivision, drawn by BME Associates, dated July 16, 2025, last revised December 29, 2025, received by the Planning Board December 30, 2025, Planning Board Application No. 01-SK-2026, the Planning Board **acknowledges receipt of a complete sketch plat application;**

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Board Secretary forward a copy of this resolution to the Applicant.

This resolution was put to a vote with the following results:

Joe Logan	Aye
Al Gallina	Aye
Scott Harter	Aye
Joe Limbeck	Aye
Trisha Turner	Aye

Approved 5 Ayes, 0 Opposed

Motion was made by Al Gallina, seconded by Scott Harter, RESOLVED the meeting was adjourned at 8:51 PM.

Lisa Boughton, Secretary

