

A public meeting of the Town of Victor Planning Board was held on January 27, 2026, at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present:

PRESENT: Joe Logan, Chairman; Joe Limbeck, Vice-Chairman, Scott Harter, Trisha Turner

ABSENT: Al Gallina

OTHERS: Francis Rose, Steve Lamarco. Bryan White, James Cretekos, Doug Eldred, David Palmer, Felipe Melo, Francis Clement, David Wright, Mark Fuentes, Francis Gorman. Wes Pettee, Town Engineer; 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:

There were none.

CORRESPONDENCE:

There were none.

BOARDS AND COMMITTEE UPDATES:

Town Board representative Dave Condon was present.

Councilman Condon - Not a lot to report. I was happy to see a few people here tonight because last night we had an empty house. So, it was a quick meeting last night and I was worried about Dave Nankin. I think it's the first meeting he's missed in five and a half years that I've been working on the board. He shoveled a little too much snow yesterday, he said. But things are off and running and things are going smooth. So, I know you got a busy agenda tonight, so it won't take up any of your time.

PLANNING BOARD reported by Lis Boughton

Tuesday, January 27, 2026

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- Wallace Minor Subdivision, located at 1195 Cork Road, applicant is requesting approval to subdivide a 6.3-acre parcel into two proposed lots.

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.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

GOOD LIFE COLLECTIVE

100-1020 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

Zoned – Commercial

Francis Gorman attorney at Harris Beach and I represent Philip Mello Enterprise, LLC, DBA Good Life Collective.

Mr. Gorman - We're here tonight for site plan approval according to the Victor Town Court Code. As the chairman mentioned, we did receive a variance approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals last week. And I can go into the variance a little bit, dealt with the setback. Under your town code, you require a setback of 1500ft, and it's measured from property line to property line. And we were short under that by 610ft, roughly. And so we got a variance for it. But under the state statute, which actually preempts the Victor Town Code. We needed to be over 2,000ft measured from entrance to entrance. And in fact, we are 2,142ft from the entrance to Flower City Dispensary. So technically, under state law, a variance was not required. This whole issue of preemption of the local law by state law has been litigated quite vociferously the last several months. And consistently, the state law has come out on top. And the Office of Cannabis Management has also issued several advisory opinions which basically speaks to the state law preempting the local law. So based upon that, we did receive our variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals unanimously. We're here for our site plan approval. This is an interior. This is a basically in the mall space and inline space. It's 1500 square feet. The mall, as you know, is 16 or 1.6 million square feet. This is not like a Chick Fil A or a Bass Pro or a hotel where we're breaking ground and there's not going to be anything structural done to the space at all.

Chairman Logan - Could you just touch on the working. The business hours of the store, please?

Mr. Gorman - The business hours of the store will be, I believe, 9am to 10pm you know, seven days a week.

Chairman Logan - If the mall closes earlier than that, you'd be closing at the same time the mall would. Correct.

Mr. Gorman – Yes. We'll be following all the regulations and rules of the mall and there is a letter of support from Wilmorite in our file.

Chairman Logan - Okay, great. Thank you. This is a public hearing. We'll give the public an opportunity to comment in a few minutes. Start with the board. Joe, Questions?

Mr. Limbeck - Oh, I got a few. Sorry. Marijuana is still a Class 1 drug under the federal law, so you're not allowed to actually bank like we would expect. There's large amounts of cash on hand that have to be transported, if I'm not mistaken. What are your plans for management of the cash? Will we be seeing armed Brinks guys going through the mall on a daily basis? How's it going to be stored on site?

Mr. Gorman - There will be a safe on site and I believe my client is here, but they're going to have a system set up to retrieve the cash. And while banking is not generally federal, banks aren't banking cannabis. There are several regional and state banks that are banking cannabis.

Mr. Limbeck – Okay, tell me what sort of clientele we're expecting in there. Is it going to be the people that are typically in the mall currently?

Mr. Gorman - We anticipate, yes. I mean, except the clientele will have to be of age and there will be you get screened when you come in. You have to have a driver's license, you have to have, you know, proof of age. And then when you actually purchase the product, once again, you have to show your identification.

Mr. Limbeck - Will we be seeing ads on TV like we do with Dick's House of Sport, etc.

Mr. Gorman - It's not clear what the state is going to do with advertising. I know they just reissued regulations regarding billboard advertising and so they're constraining the advertising.

Chairman Logan - Okay. On the advertising, what kind of signage will there be if anything other than right on the shop front in the mall?

Mr. Gorman - It's frankly whatever the mall permits. And then we'll also need a signed permit from the Town of Victor. Okay, so we anticipate it'll be a similar sign to what was prior use was an insurance company. It'll be similar sign to the insurance company.

Chairman Logan - Okay, thanks. Questions?

Ms. Turner - My concern was in regards and you're. I know you said it's been litigated, but you know, this distance, if you look at the entirety of the Eastview Mall, it's only about 591ft from the distance of the lot, so. And I know you said that was litigated, but based on the definition, you know, it's really the no portion of the cannabis retail dispensary, of the real property lot in which it cited shall be located closer than 1500ft. Now, I know that's the town code, and you're saying that the state code is going to trump that, but I am looking specifically to see where that is stated that the state, that door to door, the fact that it was litigated makes me think that that's up to interpretation.

Mr. Gorman - I mean, we have court decisions, you know, and I can submit those. Under the state law, you measure the distance between dispensaries from entrance to entrance, and that basically does trump the local law. There was a case Buenos Hill versus Saratoga Springs Planning Board, which was decided March 4, 2024, and that was affirmed by the third department. So the appellate department in 2025, Otts versus the Town of Southampton, that was just decided on December 23, 2025. There's a case in the Town of Riverhead, which was decided on September 24, 2025. Another case in Suffolk county, which was decided in November of 2025. Then the Office of Cannabis Management has issued three advisory opinions, one against the Town of Riverhead, against the Town of Southampton, and against the Town of Tuxedo, which is in Orange County. I'm not aware of any case law out there that holds otherwise.

Mr. Limbeck - Did they all involve malls or were they storefront to storefront freestanding?

Mr. Gorman - The issue was it didn't involve malls, but it was really one was the measurement of the distance between the cannabis dispensaries. But then they also dealt with other areas where the town had requirements that exceeded the requirements of the state. So under state law that the town can only do time, place and manner. But then that's further defined under nine New York code rules and regulations. Sorry to cite that stuff to you. 119.2 a. Where the operating hours, if it's in a historic district, you know, you got to comply with the architectural requirements. They can have reasonable parking controls, traffic controls, odor control, noise, and distances from public youth facilities. But other than that, the municipality can't really stray from what the requirements are under state law, and they can't. Municipality can't do it in this discriminatory fashion.

Ms. Turner - I just feel like I would need to do further research on that personally, just to make sure that that is aligning with, you know, it sounds like because there were court cases, that there was definitely up to interpretation.

Mr. Gorman - Not necessarily. I think the various municipal boards felt that their home rule authority trumped the state law. But because the state and the Office of Cannabis Management has enacted these laws, regulations, the court came out and said, no, it's clearly other than, you know, eight factors, which I just cited, it's clearly within the state's prerogative to set these distances, and a municipality can't vary from that.

Chairman Logan - Anything else, Trish?

Ms. Turner - No.

Chairman Logan - Okay. You did say early on that the zoning board granted a variance from the town's code, correct?

Mr. Gorman - Correct.

Chairman Logan - Okay. So they've already issued a variance.

Mr. Gorman - This is a permitted use in the overlay district and with site plan, I mean, we're not doing anything structurally nothing to the outside. It's an inline store. 1500 square feet, 1.6 million square foot.

Mr. Harter - I have no questions.

Chairman Logan - I don't know if there's anything from your perspective, Wes.

Mr. Pettee - I just a question for you regarding odor control, as you mentioned, is a land use management principle for these types of uses. So, with retail sales of cannabis, is there any odor, and if so, what mechanisms does this project use to control odor?

Mr. Gorman - I mean, first of all, there's no consumption whatsoever on site. And there will be HVAC equipment that's specially designed to eradicate odor. And then also under the lease with Wilmorite, which supports the use, you know, we have to make sure that there's no noxious odors emanating from the space.

Chairman Logan - Is there new equipment being installed or once it gets approved, to control it? You mentioned some new equipment. It's not there now. Correct? For odor control.

Mr. Gorman - There is some H V A C equipment there now, but the tenant is responsible for any upgrades that are required.

Chairman Logan - Okay, and you're saying that you would have an upgrade to that, or you don't know that.

Mr. Gorman - If needed, then there would be an upgrade to that? Yes. And again, under the lease with Wilmorite, we can't have noxious odors emanating from the space.

Chairman Logan - Okay, thank you, Frank. Any perspectives? Frank Pavia here, town attorney. There was a question regarding from a couple Board members.

Mr. Pavia - There's a couple things to point out. One, this is a permitted use. It's within the town's cannabis dispense retail dispensary overlay district, so it is permitted use. And secondly, you know, last Monday, the Zoning Board of Appeals did issue a variance that granted a variance from the distance separation requirements that are set forth in our code. And that was an issue that was pretty comprehensively deliberated upon by the ZBA members and basically on the understanding that, in fact, our local code provisions are very likely, if not preempted by the state regulations that deal with distance separations between retail dispensary sites as well as the way they are measured that distance is measured. So that issue has been pretty much put to bed by the issuance of the variance by the Zoning Board of Appeals. So, site plan approval is really what's left for this board to review and make a decision on.

Chairman Logan - Thank you. That's something that perhaps the town board should look at to modify the current code to make it clearer.

Mr. Pavia - It's something that the town board will likely have to consider. And it's something that. You're right. Absolutely. That the town board is going to have to review that law with the planning department's assistance and make appropriate revisions to comply with how the state is addressing these distance requirements.

Chairman Logan - Okay, great. Dave's here, so I'm sure he'll take that back to the board as well. So. All right, it is a public hearing, as I said. I'm going to open up the floor to anyone here who has any questions for the applicant or the board regarding this application. Is there anyone here wishing to speak on this?

The Board was okay with closing the public hearing.

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

Chairman Logan - Any other questions for the applicant or discussion amongst the board? Trish, do you have anything else that comes to mind?

Chairman Logan - I just want to point out the fact that if we're going to be following the Office of Cannabis Management is going to trump what our towns do across the state. They could just keep changing, moving that line. So, today we say, okay, that's what the state says. So what happens when they decide that that line gets moved and we can have them all over? At what point is there a local patrol?

Chairman Logan - That's where I look at our town attorney and say....

Mr. Pavia - It's a great question. It is a moving target. The standard by which the local governments are limited by is to ensure their provisions don't unreasonably interfere with the use as it's being promoted by the state regulations. And as the councilor had mentioned, it's essentially dealing with time, place and manner. So yeah, OCM can continue to change its regulations, but the town and villages and cities in the state can continue to press forward land use restrictions on the cannabis use as long as the courts uphold them as not unreasonably interfering with or unreasonably impractical with respect to the use. Unfortunately, as applicants counsel has indicated, there's at least three state court decisions that have said that in this instance our separation distance and the way it's measured is preempted by this state runs.

Ms. Turner - But it sounds like there were three towns that felt strongly enough that their local control was being impeded upon that they wanted to at least try to make it an issue. And my comment, I want to say that if, you know, if we just say, well the state trumps this and we never push back, if we as citizens and residents of our community don't take a stand on something, then they're just going to keep moving that mark and we're just going to keep changing what our community, the risk of what our community is. And many people don't agree that that's a healthy thing and a good thing for our community. We have to put our children first, our communities

first. And I personally think that sometimes things are worth standing up for and our kids are worth standing up for. Our communities are worth standing up for. And so, I think that because we have in our local law stating that it should be from the property and it is in my mind up to interpretation in some regards because of being reasonable to the community, I think that's up for interpretation as well. So I still have concerns with it.

Mr. Harter - I have concerns about it as well. But I was curious that we didn't really get much from the public tonight. To Trisha's point. I think if I saw a large number of people here that were wanting to speak and voice the same concern, I think that would affect how I take a look at this application. But listening to the town attorney and the history of litigation in this measure, I mean, I guess I see the possibility that we could deny the application, but it sounds like based on case law that's being cited, we wouldn't survive from Article 78.

Chairman Logan - No. I think they would raise that pretty quickly. So however, I would hope that the town board would see if the state starts moving the line or the bar or however you want to look at it that we push back on. Is this the right thing to have?

Ms. Turner - That's my concern. At what point do you say this is not reasonable? This is not good for our community? If we're not standing up for community, then who's going to stand up for them? That would definitely be something that the Town Board would address if the public raised it. I'm sorry, sir, do you have a question? I did close the public hearing, but if you have something you want to bring up, just come on up to the microphone.

Francis Clement Valentown Road

Mr. Clement - I bought a lot of Valentown Road Lot 8. I can't even remember what the address is, but we're going to build soon. I appreciate your points and I was just curious, if an individual wanted to voice their concerns, how would they go about doing that? If they're a resident of Victor, how would someone go about pushing back with the state?

Chairman Logan - I would go directly to your Town Board representatives. Go to a meeting, talk to them individually if you need to, or if you'd like to. I'm sure Dave Condon would be into that. So that would be the first place to start since the Town Board made the zoning happen. So, we'll hear it in other applications, if there are any in the future. But I would definitely go to the Town Board and talk to them. Is there any other. If there's no other discussion, we do have a draft resolution for approval. Again, the variance has been approved by the Zoning Board. So, without objection, we will move this forward. So the resolution is for the Good Life Collective, 338 Eastview Mall. Whereas the town of Victor Planning Board, the Planning Board has made the following findings of fact and there are seven of them. And again, there are copies on the back table if you wish to look at the details.

Chairman Logan read the draft resolution.

DECISION:

On motion of Scott Harter, seconded by none:

WHEREAS, the Town of Victor Planning Board (the “Planning Board”) has made the following findings of fact:

1. A site plan application was received on October 31, 2025, from Felipe Melo Enterprise LLC, d/b/a Good Life Collective (the “Applicant”) by the Secretary of the Planning Board for a Change of Use Site Plan entitled, “Good Life Collective Site Plan” (the “Application”) for the interior retail space located at 338 Eastview Mall, Victor, NY (the “Property”).
2. It is the intent of the Applicant to establish a licensed adult-use cannabis retail dispensary for an in-line store at the Property.
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 feet of the Application were notified by U.S. Mail. An “Under Review” sign was posted on the Property as required by Town of Victor Town Code.
4. The Planning Board held a public hearing on January 27, 2026, at which time the public was permitted to speak on the Application.
5. The Application constitutes a Type II action exempt from an environmental impact assessment review pursuant to 6 NYCRR § 617.5(c)(2) and (9) of the regulations of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”).
6. The Town of Victor Code Enforcement Officer reviewed the site plan in a letter dated November 13, 2025, and provided comments to the Planning Board.
7. The Applicant received an area variance on January 20, 2026, from the Town of Victor Zoning Board of Appeals permitting to locate the proposed cannabis retail dispensary at the Property.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the application of Felipe Melo Enterprise LLC, d/b/a Good Life Collective, for site plan approval entitled, “Good Life Collective Site Plan,” Application No. 33-SP-2025, as received by the Planning Board on October 31, 2025, **IS HEREBY APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

Conditions to be addressed prior to the Planning Board 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.

Ongoing conditions:

1. That the site plan shall comply with Town of Victor Design and Construction Standards for Land Development, including Section 4.
2. That the proposed cannabis retail dispensary shall not open or conduct any business prior to 9:00 a.m. nor remain open or conduct any business after 9:00 p.m. Mondays through Saturdays and shall not open or conduct any business prior to 12:00 noon nor remain open or conduct any business after 6:00 p.m. on Sundays.
3. Subject to applicable law, a cannabis retail dispensary shall provide to the Town copies of all information and documentation submitted to the State of New York in application for a license to operate under the Cannabis Law.
4. A cannabis retail dispensary shall not operate until the dispensary has obtained all licenses and permits required for it to conduct any business issued by the State of New York and any of its agencies for cannabis retail dispensary operations.
5. That a move-in permit be obtained from the Planning and Building Department.
6. That a sign permit be obtained from the Planning and Building Department.

AND, BE IT, FURTHER, RESOLVED, that the Planning Board Secretary distribute and/or file the Planning Board's approval letter in accordance with all applicable state and local laws and regulations, as well as Town Code provisions.

Chairman Logan – We have a resolution, do I hear a motion for approval?

Mr. Harter – I'll move it.

Chairman Logan - Scott moves. I need a second. Can't advance this without a second. Hearing none. The motion or the resolution is not passed. Frank. So with this not being passed, the only other way to do this would be to revisit it in the future or...

Mr. Pavia – Yes, I mean, not having the resolution not seconded. I mean, it's not even, the members aren't given an opportunity to vote yay or nay on it. So, it's basically tabled at this point until such time that the board wishes to take a vote on this resolution. The resolution has been at least introduced procedurally. There needs to be a second for it to be taken to a vote.

Chairman Logan - So not denied, but also not advanced. So, I guess we'll have to look at bringing this up again unless the applicant chooses to do something different.

Mr. Pavia - They can come back and address any of more comments or concerns. They would have to consider what actions they need to take in response to the fact that the board has decided not to move the resolution forward.

Chairman Logan - I guess I would ask those that are not inclined to second or vote on this if you could at least voice your objections or things that would need to be addressed in order to bring this forward to the board again. So, it doesn't need to be done right now, but we can revisit this at a future meeting if there's a way to move forward with this. Otherwise it's going to sit idle, I guess, and tabled.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

BARBER SITE PLAN

Benson Road

Owner – Patrick Barber

Tax Map # 6.01-1-29.300

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

35-SP-2025

Zoned – Limited Development District

Doug Eldred, engineer

Mr. Eldred – David Cox had a conflict so he asked me to step in for him. So my understanding is, as you said Joe, it's on 18.2 acres, zone residential 2 as a public water and private septic system. Labella witnessed the PERC test and deep holes on the septic system. Water Authority reviewed the plans and they're all set to go as soon as we get a pull from the planning board. My understanding from Dave was there were two issues that needed to be taken care of. One was to get a variance to have impervious area within 100ft of the wetland and that variance was obtained. I understand. And the second was to respond to the LaBella comments. And I do have a letter that Dave wrote responding to the comments and. I'll be happy to answer any questions there still may be on the project or the comments.

Chairman Logan - I understand that fire department is all set with it. I think we raised that question at the last meeting that there was short enough of a driveway, didn't require additional turnaround space. I think at the top.

Mr. Eldred - I see there was a pull off area. I don't know when it was put on, but okay, two vehicles could pass.

Ms. Boughton - The fire marshal did look at and he was okay.

Chairman Logan - Okay, great. Is that clear? Wes, would you like to address your comments and how they address them?

Mr. Pettee - We've taken a look at the applicant's responses. A lot of the comments have been addressed. Still waiting for some confirmation on the septic information from our septic people. Septic design. So I think there was some question as to whether or not a septic design on site, septic could be facilitated at this project site. I think there's some complications, some difficulties, but it doesn't sound like they are unresolvable. I think what I've heard from our folks at Labella is that we can work through those. So otherwise the majority. I think all of our comments have been addressed.

Chairman Logan - Okay, great. Open it up to the board if there are additional questions. Joe?

Mr. Limbeck - No. If Labella's satisfied with the responses to the comments, I'm good.

Mr. Harter - I don't have a lot of comments. I did take a look at the plans before the meeting tonight and I guess I agree with Wes. There are some details that need to be added to the septic. You have a situation where, as I understand that you're removing soil because the soil perks too quickly. And then you're putting down soil. And so it would seem that certain notes would need to be added from what I saw on the plans, in addition to some DOH details that could be added as well. I assume, Wes, that your person is it. Jody, that's right. I assume she's going to look at it and she would probably pick up on the same exact same things.

Chairman Logan - And before plans would be signed. If we do go ahead and approve this, that certainly would be taken care of.

Ms. Turner - I have no comments.

Chairman Logan - Okay. Nor do I. I think we're in pretty good shape. I appreciate your working with the Town Board and Planning Board and Labella to address those questions and look forward to the finished review of the septic system. However, we do have a draft resolution.

Chairman Logan read the draft resolution.

DECISION:

On motion of Scott Harter, seconded by Trisha Turner:

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

1. A Site Plan application was received on November 4, 2025, from Cox Engineering PLLC, (the "Applicant"), by the Secretary of the Planning Board for a Site Plan entitled Barber Site Plan (the "Project").
2. It is the intent of the applicant to construct a single-family home on 18.2 acres.

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. An “Under Review” sign was posted on the subject parcel as required by Town Code.
4. The Planning Board held a public hearing on December 9, 2025, at which time the public was permitted to speak on their application.
5. The application was deemed to be a Type II Action pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act Regulations and classification as such concludes SEQR.
6. The Town of Victor Code Enforcement Officer reviewed the site plan in a letter dated December 9, 2025, and December 30, 2025, and provided comments.
7. LaBella Associates reviewed the site plan in a letter dated December 12, 2025, and provided comments.
8. The Town of Victor Highway Superintendent reviewed the site plan in a letter dated November 26, 2025, and provided comments.
9. The Town of Victor Fire Marshal reviewed the site plan in a letter dated December 2, 2025, and provided comments.
10. Pursuant to Section 27-8J of the Town Code, a recreation fee for each lot, or in the event of a multiple dwelling, a recreation fee for each family unit, in lieu of park land shall be paid to the Town before issuance of a building permit.
11. Applicant received an area variance on January 20, 2026, from the Zoning Board of Appeals to allow for construction within the 100 foot buffer of a wetland.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the application of Cox Engineering PLLC, Site Plan entitled Barber Site Plan, drawn by Cox Engineering, dated November, 2025, received by the Planning Board November 4, 2025, Planning Board Application No. 35-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 the comments in a letter dated November 26, 2025, from Highway Superintendent be addressed.

- 3. That the comments in a letter dated December 30, 2025, from Code Officer be addressed.
- 4. That the comments in a letter dated December 9, 2025, from LaBella Associates be addressed.

Ongoing conditions:

- 1. That the site plan comply with Town of Victor Design and Construction Standards for Land Development, including Section 4.
- 2. Should an underground stream be encountered during construction, the Developer is to address the encroachment and impact to the underground stream to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.
- 3. That a building permit be obtained prior to start of construction.
- 4. That a highway permit be obtained for the installation of the driveway and water service connection.

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	Absent
Scott Harter	Aye
Joe Limbeck	Aye
Trisha Turner	Aye

Approved 4 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 1 Absent

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.

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

PUBLIC HEARING

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

AT&T CINGULAR WIRELESS

914 Brownsville Road

Owner – Crown Castle

Tax Map # 16.00-1-42.211/CRWN

Applicant is requesting approval to modify its equipment and installing (3) panel antennas, (6) pipe-to-pipe clamps, (3) 2-12” 10-0” pipes.

01-SU-2026

Zoned – Residential

Mark Fuentes, representative for AT&T

Mr. Fuentes - It's three two and a half inch, ten-foot-long pipes. Those are going to go into the center of the existing antenna frames. And then the antenna will be mounted at the top to match the top the other antennas. 114ft. It's a three-foot antenna.

Chairman Logan - It's additional. Like the antennas on this tower.

Mr. Fuentes - There's six antennas there. There's two per sector. They're going to add one more antenna per sector in the center of each sector.

Chairman Logan - We have it on the screen up there and there is a laser if you like to use them that you could point to. They're on each of these, the green.

Mr. Fuentes - If you go to the left. That's the antenna that'll be added proposed.

Chairman Logan - Pretty straightforward. We've seen a number of these. This is again it's on Brownsville Road. So, it's quite a distance from just about anything out there except the thruway perhaps. But start with other end of the table.

Ms. Turner - So I just wanted to understand. It's unique. The report shows that this was analyzed by a computer analysis. Just curious if you know how. Because they said that it would not hold them liable. So, who would be liable if there was an issue? Because it was not done with a live person analyzing.

Mr. Fuentes - Which report are you looking at? Mon Analysis, structural analysis? Either POD or TEP. Structural analysis is tep.

Ms. Turner - Well, answer that question. Was there a live observation of the building when they did the report or was that done theoretically? Because it sounds like it was done theoretically. So I didn't know when it said it stayed in there because it was done that way that they would not be held liable if there were issues. So, who would be held liable if there was an issue? Because they

said they would not be held liable? The company based on it not being done with a live observation.

Mr. Fuentes - Depends on what you're actually talking about maybe they're talking about the installation of the antennas. They would not be liable. They did review the pass structurals, and that's how they came up with the analysis of that. It would pass. But the liability really falls on the general contractor that installs the antenna for any failures. Falling.

Ms. Turner - They just said that because there wasn't a live analysis. There was no allowance to see any damage, anything bent, missing, loose, rusted parts. That's why they said there would not be. It would not be liable. Engineering firm. I was asking. So who would be liable then? Not the town or the.

Chairman Logan - It's Pod Engineering Group. Second page.

Mr. Fuentes - They did the mount analysis.

Chairman Logan - It just says if any of the guidelines are not met, POD Group shall not be held liable. That is what you're talking about.

Ms. Turner - So that's right. Yes, that's what I'm asking. So, who will be liable then? If there was an issue.

Mr. Fuentes - There should not be an issue. Everything passed. It's within allowable limits. Again, if the antenna did come off the tower, the general contractor that installed it would be liable. That's a very good question.

Ms. Turner - Okay, so it's not the town, though.

Mr. Fuentes - Not the town. Town's now liable.

Ms. Turner - I'm just making sure that because when I see that the liability would not be covered, I want to make sure this is not falling back on the town.

Mr. Fuentes - No.

Chairman Logan - It sounds like they made structural modifications that if they're not done, they don't want to be held liable for.

Ms. Turner - Right. Because they said that all these things weren't examined that. You know, it's hard to tell what the condition would actually be on those. The things that were not. Theoretical doesn't cover like the physical elements that could create havoc.

Mr. Fuentes - So, they didn't climb the tower and take a visual look at antenna mounts that are up there. So, they made assumptions off the past structural analysis.

Ms. Turner - And Victor Code 211 47E requires an annual report. What would that include for the annual report then?

Mr. Fuentes - Nowadays they're taking drones and they're actually flying them up around the towers. Less liability of someone falling off a tower, climbing up and looking at all the nuts and bolts and everything. Now Crown's doing it themselves and they've done an analysis this on this tower before we made our application. So, I did request one just in case, I didn't receive it yet, but that's something that could be provided if you'd like to see it. They have to report it to the town, right?

Ms. Turner - Yes, it says that requires an annual report. So, I was just wondering what specific information we would get from an annual report that would be helpful for us to make sure things are being maintained properly.

Mr. Fuentes - That would be it. Most likely visuals, because they go out there with a drone, they look around, they take pictures of the tower, take pictures of the antennas, make sure nothing is loose, hanging off, looking for rust, stuff like that.

Chairman Logan - So basically, the installer needs to verify that everything as originally designed or constructed is how to put this structurally sound. And anything that they've recommended to be upgraded to provide additional support for these new antennas is also done. Well, these guys are saying this is what you have to do. It's the contractor. I'm presuming that has to make sure that they inspect inspected as they're installing the new equipment and upgrading any attachments that are required in this report.

Mr. Fuentes - And they do it on a daily basis pretty much.

Mr. Harter - So relative to that comment. So, was that work yet to be done, or is it work that has been done that we just haven't seen yet?

Mr. Fuentes - I'm applying for a building permit, so I had to come to the here for the site plan, the review. So, once I get approval here, then I'll apply for the permit.

Mr. Harter - Part of the permit process. That analysis is done then. Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Fuentes - No, the analysis is already complete. It's the annual report that I don't have. That's Crown's private information, but they do share it.

Chairman Logan - Okay. Anything from Labella perspective? Wes? No. Okay. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone from the community that wishes to ask questions of the applicant or make any comments?

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 read the draft resolution.

DECISION:

On motion of Scott Harter, seconded by Joe Limbeck:

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

1. A Special Use Permit application was received on January 12, 2026, from Mark Fuentes, agent for AT&T Mobility (the “Applicant”), by the Secretary of the Planning Board for a Site Plan entitled AT&T Cingular Wireless at 914 Brownsville Road (the “Project”).
2. Applicant is requesting approval to modify its equipment modify its equipment and installing (3) panel antennas, (6) pipe-to-pipe clamps, (3) 2-12” 10-0” pipes.
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 27, 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 January 20, 2026, 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 Mark Fuentes, Agent for AT&T, 3391 Cambier Road, Marion, NY, Site Plan entitled AT&T, located at 914 Brownsville Road, drawn by POD Engineering Group, dated October 21, 2025, received by the Planning Board Secretary January 12, 2026, Planning Board Special Use Application No. 01-SU-2026 BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 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.

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 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	Absent
Scott Harter	Aye
Joe Limbeck	Aye
Trisha Turner	Aye

Approved 4 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 1 Absent

VALENTI MINOR SUBDIVISION

6948 Aldridge Road
Owner – Kathleen Valenti
Tax Map #16.00-1-4.131

04-MS-2025
Zoned – Residential 2

Applicant is requesting approval to subdivide a 7.04-acre parcel into two proposed lots. Lot 1 will consist of 6.408 acres and existing house and Lot 2 will consist of .623 acres.

Kathleen Valenti, owner.

Ms. Valenti - We really just want to subdivide a parcel of land to turn it into an approved building lot so our daughter can build her home.

Chairman Logan - That's where it is on Aldridge Road, not far from the rest area. So this is your home? And then this is the parcel that you're subdividing?

Mr. Limbeck - I know the Valenti's, but I don't think it's going to impact what I have to say. The only thing I know, we're not looking to do an approved building lot at this point in time. But being on the bend of the Road in Aldridge Road, I'm thinking site distances around the bend. And I would probably advise a shared driveway rather than two close together. Other than that, I think I would wait for Labella's comments, but it looks like a pretty straightforward arrangement for me.

Mr. Pettee - We did issue a comment letter only today, however, so I don't think anybody's had a chance to see it. And one of the comments that we had is about whether this is a buildable lot in terms of site distance with driveway access. So, the subdivision alone, just doing that, we don't have any assurances that there's safe site distance. So if maybe there are a way for the surveyor to put a conceptual driveway location, a curb cut location on this and identify what the site distances are, that would be very helpful. Also, I think the shared driveway or the shared access, that may be helpful too. So, we need a little more information, I think, to be able to identify whether this is a buildable lot. There is sanitary sewer infrastructure out there so they can connect to the public sewer system. Septic's not an issue. Gas. I don't know if gas is there, but water and sewer are available. So really, that was our main concern is about site distance. Site distance. And, we wouldn't recommend that the planning board approve a subdivision or approve a lot where we don't know that there's adequate site distance.

Chairman Logan - And it's taking a risk that it's not a successful thing. Now, is this for a family member or is that just. Okay. So it's possible you could tie into the driveway that's there if it was necessary.

Mr. Harter - Well, along the same lines, if you recall, we got into this issue with Ron Centola when he came with his site plan or with the subdivision, and he wanted to subdivide off the lot. And we said to him, why don't you do a site plan for that lot so we can take a look at it and make sure everything fits? He said, wants to go forward anyway. And I think that's a reoccurring theme to these sorts of projects. I think in addition to the site distance, you have the waiver that would likely be required because wherever the driveway goes, unless the existing one is used, you're within. You're affected by those separation requirements. So I think I would ask the applicant if they've done some sort of design on property for the size that you're presenting. And have you kind of deemed that to be adequate for the needs of your daughter or whomever? I mean, we just worked with a surveyor. He did that. I guess.

I guess that's always the kicker to these types of applications is that you lock yourself into a geometric figure when you create this plat map. And then it seems quite often we find as you get further on down the line, that certain issues arise that weren't known about at this juncture. I think a little more preliminary information from the standpoint of just good planning would be helpful.

Ms. Turner - I have no comments.

Chairman Logan - Okay. I share similar thoughts as Scott regarding the driveway site distance. I think really should secure the right. Have the confidence that this is a buildable lot. Either have to show using the existing entrance or site distance for another driveway cut on the inside of a curve, it'd be tough to see east on Aldridge Road. I think it is from that driveway, any approaching traffic, unless it's clear. And I think we'd need to know that. I'm going to open this up to any other comments from the community before we close the public hearing. Is there anyone here that wishes to ask questions of the applicant?

Mr. Valenti – I want to know what the difference between where the driveway is going on this lot opposed to any other driveway on Aldridge Road. As far as sight distance, coming out of the driveway, safety. Any reason. I mean, I don't understand.

Chairman Logan - Well, if you can't. If you're putting the driveway curb cut in a location that makes it dangerous. Meaning have not enough sight distance to see cars from a certain distance at the speed limit of the driveway next.

Mr. Valenti - To that, the driveway next to that, they're more on the curve than where this lot is.

Chairman Logan - They may have been preexisting. They may have already done a site distance analysis. We don't know that. But we do know that you should have one. For any proposed lot, even if it's not being approved as a building lot tonight, you need to. In order for us to approve a subdivision, you need to know that it's a buildable lot. And in order for it to be a buildable lot, you need to assure that all of the different requirements can be satisfied. Doesn't mean you have to build the driveway until you're ready to build the house. But we certainly need to know that that driveway is in a good spot for safety. I mean, I wouldn't want my kids pulling out onto the road if it's not a safe location.

Ms. Valenti - So this is something we take up with the surveyor.

Chairman Logan - Any surveyor or site engineer should be able to determine that.

Mr. Harter - I mean, Anthony is your surveyor. I know Anthony and I think actually he's presented some other projects here for which he's done exactly this. And then if a project requires a septic system, then typically we like to see that the soil's been tested. And generally speaking.

Ms. Valenti - We don't need a septic system.

Mr. Harter - That's not an issue for the system. Those are usually the two fundamentals we look at.

Mr. Limbeck - Again, the idea is to make sure that you're aware of all the potential obstacles and the things that might.

Ms. Valenti - Or that we would need to share.

Chairman Logan - I mean, you may be correct. And that driveway to the west of the one that you're proposing isn't a difficult spot. But last thing we need to do is add to it or put another driveway curve cut in the wrong place. And if it means that you can use the existing driveway and you're both safe, you and daughter with future homes, and that's great. Easy enough to do. It's done all the time.

Ms. Valenti - I think the surveyor had mentioned sharing the driveway if we would be okay with that, so I think he had.

Chairman Logan - You may have suspected that there's a sight distance issue as well.

Mr. Harter - There may also be a convenience issue that may be more convenient for you depending on what your site design turns out to be. Certainly we'd love to see you use the same driveway for two. Two lots just to reduce the number of turning movements on the highway. That's always a standard thing we look for.

Chairman Logan - I don't see any public comment. So unless there's anyone else that has questions from the public, I'll entertain a motion to close public hearing.

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 - I think that we would ask that you come back and say your surveyor's given us a good feeling.

Mr. Pettee - So the letter that we just issued today, you can get that from the town building office. Just so that we'll provide you a copy. Looks like she's giving you a copy now. We can also get you a digital copy of that so that your surveyor can see it.

Chairman Logan - And if there's something else that the surveyor can shed light on and answer. Perfect.

Ms. Boughton - Your surveyor should have it. I sent it late.

Chairman Logan - All right, so we'll see you as soon as you're ready to come back before the board. Thank you. As early as the next meeting.

Ms. Boughton - Just let me know. Send me information. Depending on when we get it. We'll decide what meeting we can put you in, but we can talk.

VICTOR COMMUNITY CHURCH FRONT ADDITION

39-SP-2025

7500-7512 State Route 251

Zoned – Light

Industrial

Owner – Victor Community Church

Tax Map #15.01-1-30.110

Applicant is requesting approval to construct an expansion of 6,920 sf for additional classroom and activity space.

Steve Lamarco of Dryer Road.

Mr. Lamarco - I'm the lead pastor at Victor Community Church, and I also recognize me from serving as the fire chief in Victor or riding on the ambulance as an EMT. We're here tonight seeking site plan approval for an addition onto our facilities at 7500 Route 251. I'm being honest, we thought we had this already when we received the requested variances from the ZBA. This need was brought to our attention when we submitted our building permit application. So that's why we're here at this point. The site plan locates the footprint of the addition on the property, and approval allows us to move forward with the building permit application. I believe several of the comments to our site plan application would be addressed in the building permitting process. Although we've been delayed in this process, we're trying to make use of a window of opportunity that we have with our contractors, so we can respectfully ask that potentially we could at least get a conditional approval tonight. There's other members of our team here that can probably respond to some of the more technical questions better than I can, but I'm happy to try and address any questions you may have with me at this time.

Chairman Logan - If you could, Joe, bring up the next slide. So, you're adding on to the building and absorbing a piece in the front of the structure. Is that correct?

Mr. Lamarco - All right, so this is the existing building, and there's a little bump out here. So, this building actually will be here. And this part of the building, it'll go over that. That part of the building will not be demolished. It will simply be encased in the addition.

Chairman Logan - Okay, so the walls, the exterior walls will become interior walls, basically on the.

Mr. Lamarco - On the west and south side. Correct. The north and the east wall. The north wall is not an exterior wall. The east wall will stay, be added to, and then it will be skinned so that it's all one.

Chairman Logan - Okay. It'll be in line with the rest of the addition. Correct. Okay. All right. And you're approaching or right at the setback line. Is that what that is?

Mr. Lamarco - We're at the setback from the ZBA variants that we've received.

Brian White of Hunt Engineers.

Mr. White - So their building plan did have a small bump out. So just kind of right in the middle. It meets right at the 50ft. Otherwise, I believe it's like another foot or two, two beyond that. Then most of it will be at 48ft or 52ft.

Chairman Logan - So I guess I'll open up to the board first and I know Wes will have some questions.

Mr. Limbeck - I am good.

Mr. Harter - So the effective setback is 50ft, is that right?

Mr. White - Yeah, there is a small bump out that'll be right at 50. Most of it'll be at 52. But, yes.

Mr. Lamarco - The bump out is for static.

Mr. Harter - And I assume that the town looked at that and variance is not required.

Mr. Lamarco - Correct. So that variance was received in 2023. So back then we had a phasing plan that had been started knowing that these phases were going to be coming along. So one of the phases that we came here a year, two or so ago was additional parking in the back and an office addition towards the back a little bit. And so this is kind of that next phase of adding onto the front of this building.

Mr. Harter - Okay, so is your parking satisfactory for the additional use of the building?

Mr. Lamarco - So there's no change to our current Sunday service opportunities. This addition actually just gives more space to the kids. So, it doesn't give us greater capacity for Sunday morning services. It simply gives more space for the kids, younger kids, teenagers.

Mr. Harter - And if you needed more parking, it looks like, I think you were before us before. I think when you did a subdivision or something, you acquired more land, right?

Mr. Lamarco - We're just under 10 acres.

Mr. Harter - So if you needed more parking, you could move to the northwest with additional parking.

Ms. Turner - On full disclosure, I am a member of the Victor Community Church and Pastor Steve is my pastor. So, I probably think it's appropriate for me to abstain from tonight. So, I'll do the appropriate thing.

Chairman Logan - You told me that last time when you found this coming up. So, no problem. We'll go to Joe then, since he wanted some time.

Mr. Limbeck - What I was trying to make sure is, if I may, I'm looking at the phase two southwest view. Correct. Is that the facade? Is that the facade that's going to be facing Route 251? So, yes, the south one more southwest view on phase two. There it is on the bottom left. Yeah, that was my concern. I just wanted to make sure that I was oriented looking at it. And your comments about the existing entrances and parking are staying the same. The trees that you're replacing, I imagine you're not going to put in the monster trees, but I couldn't see the size of the two new trees that you're putting in. Are they pretty good size?

Mr. Lamarco - Well, we'll put in what we are able to put in. Yes. We're not going to be able to replace what's there, but in like kind we would put those in the appropriate place.

Mr. Limbeck - And I don't have any comments. I was just more concerned about the appearances from the roof.

Chairman Logan - So one of my thoughts was this is a significantly taller building than the rest of the existing structure, correct?

Mr. Lamarco - No. So, if you look at this, which is the worship space, it's in line with that. The office is a lower roof line, but it's in line with or consistent. Yes, it might be. It's about three feet taller, but it's consistent with and in style and structure. It's basically creating a tee there.

Chairman Logan - And I didn't mean for that comment to be sounding pejorative about it, but I'm just wondering, will you see any of the other building behind it? Once you put this up, is this going to be the dominant feature on the site?

Mr. Lamarco - Well, I mean if you're driving by, since it's the most front facing, sure it will be. But I don't think it hides everything else necessarily, especially when you're coming from the east or west, you'll still see the back of the facility, I believe.

Chairman Logan - So the front of like the 251 side is this long side here, is that correct? Joe, I didn't mean to interrupt. I was sort of going with your thought on the only other thing on uncertain of.

Mr. Limbeck - I'm trying to recall where it says Victor Community Churches. There's a current existing sign by the, by the entrance driveway, is that correct?

Mr. Lamarco - There's a sign in the front yard that we simply rebranded the sign, the existing sign that was there prior to us purchasing the property. And then on the building itself, there's a welcome over the entrance doors.

Chairman Logan - It's down here probably, right? And this yellow, just this be clear, is what's existing right now. That small piece and you're absorbing it with the rest of it that will.

Mr. Lamarco - Absorb aesthetically with the rest. Correct.

Mr. Pettee - Labella issued a letter. When was it dated here? January 20th. And I think they probably is putting together or has provided some. Some responses already. One of the questions that we had or one of the clarifications we wanted is just to identify the species and diameter of trees that were going to be removed. And I see you've got a replacement plan for those trees as well. And for note number six, additional approvals. They did note that they received the variance. I think we'd just like to have them provide a little more specificity in that the variance was granted. Expand the notes so that it identifies that the 50-foot setback variance was granted on. I think it was August 21, 2023. With regard to the water service, has there been any contemplation of relocating the water service as opposed to building on top of the service where it is today?

Arna Larson, member of Victor Community Church.

Mr. Larsen - All three services come out the front of the building. So we've got the water service, the gas service and electric service. So, we're talking to the utility entities about how to best address that. Either cut the service short and take it up at the front wall or reroute around the building or can it remain beneath the building? So, we're exploring all options. As well as the FDC comment that's also coming to the front wall, that'll be moved out and we'll have a charge line extended inside this building space. Okay. So, this site plan approval is really for a shell permit to build the shell of the building. And then we need to identify where these services are. And then we're going to identify with the utility entities, help us to address that. But our mechanical space, our water riser room, that's all going to remain in its current location and we'll be able to kind of route utilities to it.

Chairman Logan - Are the utilities owned right up to the building face right now by the utilities, so they're out at the road. Basically, these are all our services. Sometimes they run it up and it's on your property. For instance, our electric goes to a transformer that's a couple hundred feet back from the road.

Mr. Larsen - So they're all private services from the road to our structure.

Mr. Pettee - That's helpful, I guess, if the, if the Locations of these utilities may change as a result of the work and investigation that they're doing. And they're looking for approval on this so called shell, whether or not we want to have them remove those on a site plan that might be

provided for signature. Just thinking about or if we sign that, I guess it could be taken care of during a building permit process.

Mr. Larsen - So, the point of origin the streets will remain the same. And so what we would do is intercept that service at the south wall, the move south wall and either route around the building, tight to the building, or more likely we'll take house, wire up through the addition to the main panel internally and have the meter. That would make the most sense from a financial perspective is to just cut the services short.

Chairman Logan - Are the meters now at the existing building phase? They just have to be relocated.

Mr. Larsen - They're on the west face. Right at the southwest corner.

Mr. Pettee - And can those can be identified on the site plan? I can't remember if I saw the meters. They might be there.

Mr. Larsen - It's in the very south end of the west long wall.

Mr. White - I may not show them on this side. Like I said, there's been so many phases with this so far that I don't recall if I.

Mr. Larsen - We'll work with the utility company and make sure that whenever they deem is appropriate for if this. Put that on the plan. And so when we come in for the building permit of the interior spaces, we'll have that identified as well as the sprinkling comments and things.

Chairman Logan – So you will need two building permits, one for the shell and then. Correct. When you're ready to do the interior finish.

Mr. Larsen - So that's why we had submitted the shell permit. We thought we could actually advance the shell construction late last fall, but we learned that we couldn't. So, we wanted to focus on getting a shell permit. And we've been working with staff to kind of program out the children's space and make sure that we've got the classroom set up the way that we deem is appropriate. So that's kind of been our winter project lately.

Mr. Harter - Wes, could they just add a note to the plans indicating what they plan to do with the.

Mr. Pettee - Yes, that's not a bad thought, Scott. I think that would be appropriate.

Mr. White - That's easy enough to do.

Mr. Pettee - So roof drainage just be sure to clarify on the site plan locations of all the downspouts, the connections of the existing storm system, if any splash blocks. I think we'd like to see a lighting plan. Just because you've got some proposed pictures I think towards the front of

the building that are closer to the 50-foot setback. So, if you can provide a lighting plan with illumination levels, that would be great.

Mr. White - I've got my lighting engineers actually putting a plan together. They're working on that today, so we should be able to have that, no problem. The 30 watt that we do show, as the comment mentions, that's a 50-foot throw. If we have to go down to 20 watts or something, that's about a 40-foot throw. Keep it away from that property line a little bit.

Mr. Larsen - Those lights on the front are just accident lights. There's not public spaces that we're going to be utilizing this space out front. So, we don't need to illuminate the front yard. So whatever the photometrics say we need to do, we'll tune them down.

Mr. Pettee - So with regard to wetlands, I know there are no wetlands on your project parcel, right? And I think across the street, however, there's maybe a wetland adjacent area. Have you given any thought as to the need, the potential need to submit to dec?

Mr. White - I talked to our environmental group about that and went through it. They feel that the informational wetland layer is pretty liberal right there. It almost comes up to the road. So even from the far shoulder of the south side of the road to where the new addition would be is about 110ft. So technically it's beyond the 100 foot that would require going for that JD with DEC. So, they felt comfortable that even going from that far shoulder side and we're beyond that 100 foot that there wouldn't be an impact. And it's just a culvert that comes across the other side. So, there wouldn't be any potential over on the property itself.

Mr. Pettee - We had a little landscaping comment, but that's pretty much the substance of our letter. So as long as if we could get a written response to the comments. That's beautiful. Especially that wetland one. Just so that we have it on record, documentation is to some thought was put into those comments.

Chairman Logan - Wes, you talked about drainage and addressing it. On one of the plans it says downspouts to terminate on a splash block and that's at the southwest or east corner is that something that. Shouldn't that be underground and piped away from the building?

Mr. Larsen - It will be underground.

Mr. White - That one will end up going and tying it. We've got an underground roof drainage system right now. So that would extend and tie into it from that one. So that note would end up being eliminated and saying to connect into existing underground.

Chairman Logan - I just get concerned because you're right at the road, you know, limits and in terms of the easement.

Mr. Larsen – On the south wall we will have four downspouts going either side of the bump out. And then we'll be taking a hundred round storm on the west side and tying into the existing pipe that's there. And it routes to our retention system that's in the back.

Mr. White - And south wall closer to the existing building. That drainage actually goes towards the north of the property as it is already.

Chairman Logan - So you'll tie into that correct drainage setup once this shell is built. I'm just sort of scrolling around your drawings here. Anything else, Wes?

Mr. Pettee - That's it for me.

Chairman Logan - This is an open public hearing. Is there anyone from the community at large has any question? Nothing online, I assume.

The Board was okay with closing the public hearing.

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

Chairman Logan - We need to see this again, Wes, or do we have a... Adam, actually, Adam Ryzcek, Code Enforcement Officer. Adam, do you have any comments you want to portray? The number three was in particular, I think something we discussed briefly was.

Mr. Ryzcek - Wes touched on most of my comments. The water service, the lighting plan. I didn't have anything beyond that.

Mr. Harter - I think if they make the revisions that we spoke about and submit. Okay, that'll be good. Wes would check that before it goes forward.

Chairman Logan read the draft resolution.

DECISION:

On motion of Scott Harter, seconded by Joe Limbeck:

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

1. A Site Plan application was received on December 23, 2025, from Victor Community Church, (the "Applicant"), by the Secretary of the Planning Board for a Site Plan entitled Victor Community Church Front Addition Site Plan (the "Project").
2. It is the intent of the applicant to construct an expansion of 6,920 sf for additional

classroom and activity space.

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. 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 27, 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. There was a Coordinated Fire Service Site Plan Review on January 27, 2026, and provided comments.
7. The Town of Victor Code Enforcement Officer reviewed the site plan in a letter dated January 20, 2026, and provided comments.
8. LaBella Associates reviewed the site plan in a letter dated January 20, 2026, and provided comments.
9. The Landscape Consultant reviewed the project on January 5, 2026, and January 20, 2026, and provided comments.
10. Applicant received an area variance on August 21, 2023, from the Zoning Board of Appeals to reduce the front parking setback from 61 feet to approximately 50 feet.
11. Applicant received an area variance on August 21, 2023, from the Zoning Board of Appeals to reduce the building front setback from 83 feet to approximately 50 feet.

WHEREAS, the Town of Victor Town Code Chapter 211-27.1 F(2)(d), allows for the reasonable reduction of parking spaces required in the overlay district and shall be permitted by the Town of Victor Planning Board; and,

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board allow the reduction of parking spaces from 150 to 100 parking spaces be approved by the Planning Board; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Victor Planning Board reviewed the Unlisted Action on January 27, 2026, and identified no significant impacts; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the project, Victor Community Church, 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 Victor Community Church, Site Plan entitled Victor Community Church Front Addition Site Plan, drawn by Hunt Engineers, dated December, 2025, received by the Planning Board December 13, 2025, Planning Board Application No. 39-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 the comments in a letter dated January 20, 2026, from LaBella Associates be addressed.
- 3. That the comments in a letter dated January 20, 2026, from Code Officer be addressed.
- 4. That the comments in a letter dated January 27, 2026, from the Fire Marshal be addressed.
- 5. That the comments in a letter dated January 20, 2026, from the Landscape Consultant be addressed.

Ongoing conditions:

- 1. That the site plan comply with Town of Victor Design and Construction Standards for Land Development, including Section 4.
- 2. Should underground water conditions be encountered during construction, the Developer is to address the encroachment and impact to the underground water conditions to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.
- 3. That a building permits be obtained prior to start of construction of the building addition.

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	Absent
Scott Harter	Aye
Joe Limbeck	Aye
Trisha Turner	Abstained

Approved 3 Ayes, 0 Opposed, 1 Abstained, 1 Absent

WOODS AT VALENTOWN SECTION 1 REAPPROVAL

40-SP-2025

High Point Drive

Zoned – Planned Development District

Owner – Valentown Woods LLC

Applicant is requesting reapproval of the June 26, 2022, approved site plan for Woods at Valentown. Section 1 consists of the construction of two 42-unit buildings, a proposed clubhouse and associated site layout.

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

Mr. Cretekos - As Mr. Logan just mentioned, we are here for final reapproval of section one. Only tonight we do have an application and we'll be in front of you guys at your second February meeting to start talking preliminary subdivision approvals for sections two through four. I have the townhouses, the 100-unit apartment and the other townhouse section. So those are all at the north end of the site. So section one is just the portion that is closest to Valentown Road. This will now be the fourth time we're asking for approval on basically the same thing. If you recall, back in 2017 and 2018, we went through the PDD changes. This was originally approved with the 84 units clubhouse between four apartment buildings instead of the two in 2019.

That plan was then re approved, I believe in 2021 that expired again. Then the ownership of the properties, that's when it transferred to Commercial Street Partners LLC. And we came back in the last time around with them and that was the same 84 units but between the two-building configuration where basically the four units were kind of mashed together to help get some economies of scale. This is an updated rendering of the whole site. This is current and reflects everything on sections two through four as well with all our new tree lines based on where all our clearing limits and everything. So, this is as current of a exhibit for the overall project. Again, section one is just these two longer buildings and this clubhouse here. This area itself has about 58% green space. The overall woods of Allentown parcel is going to be close to 80%. Again, the minimum requirements lead down at 35. There's a 65% overall for the High Point Business Park, but that includes the retail buildings and some of this down here. That number sits about 71% when we're done with this now, so we're still in compliance with all the overall PDD requirements.

This lot down here also complies with everything that was established by the Town Board. That is the current zoning from the PDD. Water for this one will be made via a connection to the public water main system that terminates here. If you recall with this project, when they built High Point Drive in the office buildings, water, public water was extended down Turk Hill quite a ways. I think that happened around 2012, if I'm not mistaken. And that was brought up to serve

the office buildings as well as this whole development. So, our service for section one, we're going to tap onto that. We're going to come into our clubhouse. We're going to have master meter and backflow and then we're running private water and fire lines down to serve all of this.

The original plans back in 2005 had always had this connecting, when the town of Victor maintained the water having this connecting to the system on Valentown Road with a pressure reducing valve. That has been not the case since the water authority basically took over. And they don't see the need and they haven't seen the need for that interconnection. So that is why the public main will stop there and everything for section one is going to all be private.

Chairman Logan - So it won't be connected to Valentown Road.

Mr. Cretekos - There will be no connection from the pressure system that is Turk Hill in the upper areas here to the lower pressure system that's on Valentine Road. There would have never been a connection besides the one way feed from the higher pressure zone to the lower one. But based on everything that's kind of transpired and how water authority has been operating system, that connection went away I think around 2019, if I'm not mistaken, when we did those original plans.

Sewer for this right now, sewer for the office buildings has always kind of gone down the hill this way and tied in through a connection here. For sections two through four there's a couple pieces of public main sitting up here that are currently inactive. It stopped here at the north end and then it started again here at the south end. Basically we knew that this had the potential to change. So, part of this will be connecting the dots between the public sewer system and that will also enable sections 2 through 4 to be active as well.

Chairman Logan - So the sewers from buildings 1, 2 and 300 will all still remain going to where they go now?

Mr. Cretekos - They all route down to this area and then they cut down the hill to get into the system that then runs back to the pump station. Stormwater for this. This pond was originally built with High Point Drive bur beam basically not touching this thing. It still functions exactly as designed. So, all of the stormwater for section one, as well as a good chunk of the office building gets down into this pond. We have storm sewers that are going to be running on the east side of this building. All of the downspouts for all the buildings getting collected, all taken to the pond. So, the only runoff that's going to be going over the property line is literally what hits the grass there and then falls off due to grade. So, we'll be reducing kind of what's going there today. Overall drainage obviously is being managed between that as well as our infiltration basin, which we can talk a Bit more about when we get to sections two through four. There are a couple new bioretention areas that we did add. When we went through this to comply with some of the

new regulations. That was something that we had worked through with Mary Steblein over at labella on exactly how we were going to kind of update this design to comply with a new general stormwater permit. Because the notice of intent for this was filed back in 2005 and it still is open and current.

Mr. Pettee - So those bio retention areas that are. That are new, that's in section one?

Mr. Cretekos - Correct. And we will have some. We will have one in section two and a couple in section four as well. And the idea for that was we were going to any impervious surface that we were creating beyond what the original NOI was approved for, retreating as a new project and basically providing full water quality and runoff production for those at a local area. If you look at the project from a comprehensive standpoint, this is an infiltration basin. This thing infiltrates significantly more than what we would need to do for RRV or water quality requirements.

Mr. Pettee - So, for the bioretention area, do we have a copy of that site plan that shows that change with the bioretention?

Mr. Cretekos - Yes. The mylars that we resubmitted that were signed by you guys have those bioretentions in them. And then the section 2 through 4 engineers report that we just submitted is comprehensive and includes all of the storm audit for section one and four. Not that anything changed with this reapproval for section one right now.

Chairman Logan - Do you have a build schedule? 1, 2, 3, 4.

Mr. Cretekos - So the intent is to start with the. The townhouse units because of the capital from selling the lots is a little bit. So overall plan, I believe will be start with sections 2 and or 4. The way that I'm kind of getting into the other stuff, but the way these were kind of designed was old sections 2 and 4 are going to have cut. So we're going to be lowering the elevation up on the top of the hill. Cut from that material comes and makes the fills we need in section one and a little bit in section three. Section three is pretty close to a balance. Just needs a little bit. So basically what's going to happen is we're going to get this approved. We do have to do some work in here because we do need to build the sewers. We are planning on bringing in the fill. You know, the applicant may decide to enable the clubhouse sooner to provide that amenity to the townhouse units before. So really it's probably going to be 2, 4 happening probably up front or, you know, sequentially, and then probably section one and then three.

Chairman Logan - So everyone in the development, whether apartment or townhouse, will have access to the clubhouse.

Mr. Cretekos - That I believe is the intent. Right now the townhouses will have an HOA as well. I know you can't quite see it here, but there is kind of a red outline here as well as here. So the for sale lots will, you know, those private drive sections will be basically maintained by them. And then the rest of the private drives for section one as well as into section three are going to be retained by Commercial Street Partners. And then they're going to manage the property as well as the renting of the apartments.

Chairman Logan - I assume all the HOA's will be clear to those purchasing townhomes that eventually the clubhouse will be part of their responsibility and benefit.

Mr. Cretekos - Yes. I'm not sure maybe if that's something that, you know, Commercial Street Partners wants to turn over to the HOA for them to manage. That is something that probably needs to get worked out for final details. But as of right now, my understanding is Commercial Street Partners is maintaining ownership of that. I think they would probably more rent space to the HOA for meeting rooms or allow them to use, you know, the pool or the, the bar or whatever is going to be in that clubhouse.

Chairman Logan - Wouldn't there be a membership fee to everybody in the HOA to have access to it?

Mr. Cretekos - Potentially, yes. Again, that's the semantics of that. I'm not sure.

Chairman Logan - My challenge is making sure that it is crystal clear to whoever wants, whoever's buying it that eventually they'll have that or have the option not to have that if that's the case. Feature on their lease or HOA fee.

Mr. Cretekos - Part of the HOA's is, you know, quite a bit of educational purposes for the builder and then even for, you know, us, kind of engaging. How do you guys want to establish the corporation and everything like that? So whatever entity ends up building the townhouses and stuff will generally take the lead on the HOA construction.

Chairman Logan - Okay. Wes. Sorry, was there anything else?

Mr. Pettee - All set for right now.

Mr. Cretekos - We did get some comments from a couple of the town reviewers. Codes. Didn't really have any comments. Farmington Water and Sewer asked us to update their details. That's easy. We'll do that before we reprint and then reroute mylar's for signature. Highway was the typical work permit within the right of way. We did get some landscape comments for the sketch plan that are kind of applicable to this. They did kind of ask if we're going to be planning on doing any foundation plantings for the apartment buildings or the clubhouse. The plan has

always been no, we're not planning on doing that really. Hanlon is still the architect. So, it's the same building designs that we've had the whole time. The intent is to really bring out the architectural feel of that and then promote the woods on the property, bigger trees, things like that. There are some larger street trees. You can kind of see them scattered in here on the rendering just to kind of break it up. And then there is some, you know, bare root tree transplant areas. You know, the things that we were kind of talking with Fred Rainaldi when he was here about that. So, there are, there is an area in section one that we're going to be doing that again that's called out on the plans already today. And then there will be another section up here in section three where we have some ability to replant in a slope area that we had to clear.

Chairman Logan - Are there retaining walls at all needed for any of these four pieces?

Mr. Cretekos - Right now the only retaining structures are the backside of the clubhouse acts as a retaining wall because of the road sits up about 14, 15ft. So that's going to come down, you're going to see a couple feet exposed up and then you'll see the eave and then the pitch of the roof. Besides that, no, we've really been able to get rid of all the retaining walls here with the exception of a couple coming into the garage for the apartment building and then one on the backside of this parking lot here where it lets us not cutting to the slope. We've always had a retaining wall at that location. That's something that we can't really get away from.

Chairman Logan - Are they consistent with the retaining walls in the commercial side or stone?

Mr. Cretekos - Basically we have reduced the retaining walls with this plan at sections 2 through 4 now compared to what it used to be. Significantly, there was a lot more retaining walls because of the access into the underground parking and things of that nature. Now with the townhouse units, we have the ability to walk out the backs of the buildings. They can fit better into the grade. There's a lot less earthwork overall.

Chairman Logan - I got no problem with that part of it. Trying to reduce walls is always a good thing in my opinion. But the architect, the construction of it, I mean those are all beautiful as a handle stone, concreted stone walls going up High Point and in the areas where, I mean, you can see them when you drive up from the cobblestone area. So my question is, are the walls that remain as part of your design now, are they going to be stone also or are they going to be something different?

Mr. Cretekos - I'm not sure on what the exact finish of that would be. I mean, that's something that we don't typically specify. I mean, whether I would assume that they'll want to do something decorative to match the architecture of the buildings that they're, you know, beautifying. Basically. They aren't just the typical buildings, but again, the only real retaining wall I think that you would even have a. You'd be able to see anywhere is if you'd have to drive into the

apartments off of High Point Drive. So, you're not going to see any new retaining walls from the public right away as you're driving.

The last set of comments we got was, I think from Parks and Rec. They had a couple comments. The first one had to do with the trails. Obviously, the woods of Allentown Trails has always been a big thing that Fred and now Dave Christa wants to continue as part of section one. We had two trail connections shown through kind of the sloped area between the office buildings and section 1. Parks Department kind of alluded to them possibly wanting to take the lead on constructing and sitting those trails. I talked with the applicant and we are more than willing to let them kind of do that. We would like to obviously have some coordination with them, but we would be happy to kind of let them spearhead it. It'd probably be a better thing too, for long term maintenance if the Parks and Rec guys actively use the trails in this area, you know, contribute to it and maintain it.

Chairman Logan - So, I don't remember seeing that they wanted to actually build them, but I know there was some recommendations that. I know hiking trails is here, but Brian Emilson made a comment on sidewalks on the west side. I think it was.

Mr. Cretkos - Yes, that was the next thing I was going to touch on.

Mr. Limbeck - The second comment talked about a five foot wide asphalt or concrete walkway on the west side. And from a couple perspectives, I think it's worth a little more consideration. If people are going to access those hiking trails, for instance, walking up and down the roadway, probably not the safest alternative for it. And if it goes down all the way to Valentown Road, I get that there's no sidewalks currently at Valentown Road. But if you're considering a parking space down on Valentown Road and High Point Drive, it would be a good tie in point for that. And I'm not sure of the distances from maybe a proposed parking spot over to say, Starbucks and Olive Garden. It might be just an attractive opportunity for people to walk to and from dinner or coffee, whatever people like to get out and walk. I think it's probably worth a little more consideration for the sidewalk.

Mr. Cretkos - And then those kind of conversations with the sidewalk have come up. I think every time we've been in front of this board. I think kind of dating all the way back to the original. There was never plans to have sidewalk there. There was always some concern about town maintaining, you know, the public sidewalk along this portion of the right of way due to the sloped and kind of almost isolated area from the rest of the locations that would be plowed regularly by the town.

As part of the Woods when we went through the PDD, there was always plans to have the natural surface trails. So, sections 2 through 4 had natural surface trails that ran up along the

drive. So not sidewalks. There was a connection between the two existing road stubs here that was going to be proposed and is proposed again, some trails in the woods and then trail connections up here. There was never in plans to have sidewalks constructed along High Point Drive. Our preference would be to continue to maintain that. And again, same thing. There is no sidewalks along Valentown Road along that stretch. And constructing sidewalk there was something that I know Fred Rinaldi had had us looked at a couple of times to help facilitate bringing or creating a connection here.

There is some limited space there would require retaining walls. There are some issues obviously with proximity of that sidewalk to the travel lane that we were looking at without having some costly construction impacts. So, I definitely don't want to be committing our client to any construction on Valentown Road public. I think for section one. Since we're just looking for a reapproval now on that today, I think we still have the opportunity to discuss sidewalks. With the section two through four preliminary and final subdivision approvals that we're going to be doing here in the next couple months.

And then that would give us an opportunity to really kind of flush out, mdoes it make sense to do sidewalks here and kind of evaluate it from a town, a town standpoint as a something you guys are willing to maintain, or is there some kind of middle ground that we could maybe get to or something? Maybe the HOA could take some ownership of or something of that nature.

Mr. Limbeck - The final point with the five to six vehicle parking area, you're open to discussing that a little bit more?

Mr. Cretekos - Yes, we're absolutely open to that. The one thing I would like to point out is we don't have any property on the south side of the Valentown Road. So, Fred Rainaldi retained the one little farmer here in the southwest portion here is the farmer's land. So basically, the only portion that we have in it, and I was kind of thinking about the comment. I was wondering if they actually meant more of a parking area here at the south intersection of our section one where it might make more sense and then have one of those trail heads down the slope kind of tie right into that. So, if that's something that we're talking about there, that was something that we would definitely consider. We just want to make sure the location is something that is on something makes sense. That's on property control by the applicant too.

Chairman Logan - Because honestly, I don't think I'd want to see it on Valentown Road proper. It doesn't. You know, it's heavily used.

Mr. Cretekos - It's not a safe location along there with the roads off Valentown. So, I drive it every day.

Chairman Logan -- This is all High Point Drive, right? The whole stretch of road.

Mr. Cretekos - Yes, this is all High Point Drive.

Chairman Logan - Right. So anywhere on High Point Drive that makes sense in the vicinity you were talking about, I would personally.

Mr. Cretekos - And basically the woods property kind of follows the flag up here and then there's basically it cuts through the middle here. So, everything up on the top of the hill. This is all still owned by the office parks. 100, 200, 300. And then everything along the lower portion on both sides is owned by the applicant. So as long as we're within the right of way along that or just within lands that we control, we can certainly find a nice spot to designate that. Or maybe it's even something that we can expand internal to the site to make it a little safer.

Mr. Limbeck - Great. I'm pleased that you're considering these because Victor hiking trails do a really good job making sure Victor's walkable. And I think this is going to be up.

Mr. Cretekos - And that was something that Dave Christa wanted to make sure that we carried through with this. Just because that was something that was kind of key with that Fred was always talking about was making sure we're expanding the trails out here and making them usable. So, you know, we're willing to just work with the Parks Department to kind of as much as they want to do. I think we'd be happy to entertain it.

So, I think that pretty much covers everything that I wanted to touch on. So again, we're looking to do reapprovals. I have all the building elevations. I also have the balloon study photos that we did and the visualization, like the true rendering that we did of this building from Valentown Road. So let's just walk through those. If you guys have any questions on things, please interrupt. Please stop me.

These are the bigger buildings here. So basically, kind of looking from the south end up the front of it, this is kind of the central area that's carved out between the two buildings. There's parking on the first floor. It's a little bit taller ceilings on the first floor there. There's apartments on the front of the first floor here and then there's apartments on the full second and third floors. If you remember, the parking garage does not go all the way straight through the building. It basically comes to the center area where all the elevator towers and things are. But there is garage entrances on both sides. There are 84 garage spaces, so there's a covered space for every unit.

There's another external space for every unit. And then there's another 25 spaces for the clubhouse. So there's good parking here for all the units. If you want to just keep flipping through these slowly. So same idea. Another view from the building. This is back of the building. This isn't a rendered view from Valentown.

This is just Hanlon's kind of 3D graphics thrown in there. So, you can keep going. Here's the front elevation of the building. So obviously you can kind of see the smaller central area as well as kind of what the older maskings are. Code height here, 48ft max. Our eaves are approximately 39, and the peak of the roof is about 44. So, we're four feet below the maximum. This is basically done the same thing every approval that we've been here for. So just a couple more elevations of the back of the ends to kind of show the entrances. Again, just architectural buildings. These aren't bricks. There's lots of balconies, peaks, roofs really trying to break this up and make it not, you know, a prison cell type project.

Chairman Logan - I don't think Dave's going to design a prison cell. No, no. This is the clubhouse.

Mr. Cretekos - So same kind of architectural feel, you know. Basically, this sits kind of at the north end of the site. This is the bumped out portion of the building. Main entrance, the pool sit to the north end, which will be right here. On the back of this side is what's going to be the retaining structure. Just the other couple elevations of this. Again, these don't quite show the retaining feature of this. So, there'll be a little bit less detail on the backside. So, this is the visualization photo from Valentown Road. So, this sits southeast of our site a little bit. Looking up into it, you can kind of see the buildings placed here. So these buildings are all placed based on the old balloon study photos that we shot when we did this in 2018, 2019. When we did that, we had the 21-unit apartment buildings for this. They're effectively in the same location. We went and flew balloons at 48ft in height. all these locations you can't quite see the balloons because they're a little bit less apparent. There's one like right there you can kind of pick out in the photo. Without these it's a little bit apparent, but this is the view you get as you drive around kind of the bend to Valentown, in a leaf off condition.

Chairman Logan - So again, so this is from Valentown Meadows area that the gentleman here in front, there are houses except for Lot 8 of apparently that's yours.

Mr. Cretekos - And then even in the background, this is where you can kind of see the peak of the office building that peaks through the trees at night when the lights are on. So, you know, those still sit a little bit higher than what we have out here today.

Mr. Harter - This is probably the one nearby view that I'm most concerned with and I guess I just need to go back a little bit and say that, you know, I've been in the town for a while and I remember when the balloons were first done, when High Point went in for the initial building. I remember Bruce Bomke was presenting to the board at the time and it was an issue that was very important to the town because it kind of encroached on a piece of real estate that no one ever thought could be developed. And it was my understanding at that time that there was a unique

type of building, office building as it is now, and that most development would be well secluded on that hillside. But when I look at the plans and I see it in particular this side, in this particular phase of what you're doing, you're taking all the vegetation out to about the property line from what I can tell on your site plan. And you end up with like one on two steep slopes, the building there on down. So perhaps on the other side of the tree row that's shown there, I think you would get a different view to what you're speaking about. But I just think that from a visual impact perspective, this portion of the project is going to be highly visible. And I've driven by now multiple times since I've seen the application kicking around here as recently as Sunday night.

Just once again look at it and I can see the main building with the lights on and such. And that seems reasonable considering the original study that was done. But this goes up, unless I'm mistakenly reading the drawing, which I don't think I am, this goes right up to the edge of the property line. So, all the vegetation will be removed there in favor of a steep slope going up to the east side of the buildings. And I don't see how you can avoid a significant visual impact from that. So, my question is, what can be done to buffer that? Then all the natural vegetation will be removed. I don't know if you can get anything to grow on looks to be a one on two slope. I see that you're proposing a mesh product to hold the soil together because of its steepness. But we've seen before, it's hard to get things to grow on slopes like that. So, my question is what can be done to offer this visually besides architectural amenities in terms of roof lines and balconies and things like that.

Mr. Cretkos - So I think when we've kind of been talking about this over the years now, I don't think we've ever really tried to hide the fact that this is going to be visible from Valentown Road. You know, obviously we're providing the visualization here. You can clearly see the buildings through the tree lines. Obviously leaf on conditions will be a little bit better. And depending exactly which tree line you're standing in front of or behind, yes, there's more or less views, but part of kind of the whole rezoning of this, the discussions with the Town Board, the discussions on the height, establishing the 48 foot max three stories, that has been kind of the established zoning for this project back since 2018, 2017 when the rezoning was done.

And even so much as when we went back since through with Town Board this summer for the changes to the PDD again to allow for the four-story apartment building that's going to be in section three, as well as understanding that we're going back to the townhouse units. So, changing the maximum density down back to 255, which is a reduction of 39 units.

I think from this standpoint, Scott, I do understand what you're saying. I think, we can look at if there's any feasible way to try and minimize clearing to that property line. But basically, to get the grades to work and function off the site, there really isn't too much flexibility we have back there. We can certainly look at some screenings. But again, in the context of a 48-foot building,

there's not going to be too many plantings you're going to put up there anytime, you know, short term that are going to, you know, have a substantial effect on that.

Mr. Harter - So just let me see if I can get this clear in my head. When it first came in, it was supposed to be a PUD or PDD, I guess. And then you said there was a zoning change thereafter that enabled what we're seeing here. Is that correct?

Mr. Cretekos - So when the original PDD was established in 2005, it included the retail things, so the Olive Garden in that area and included all three or four of the office buildings, if I'm not mistaken. I think there was a building 400 back then. And then the woods of Valentown component was a townhouse component back then. It did not have the northwest section that got added in and 2017, that used to be part of the Forest Park PDD that got basically assimilated into the woods. Fred Rainaldi acquired that and then we went through that, we rezoned that and kind of worked through that. And at that time that was how we were going to facilitate the transition in the town. That was part of the comprehensive goals at the time to transition from the office to apartments down to the single-family homes. So, to make kind of the project viable at that time, that was when we had the 21-unit buildings. And that's how the PDD code stands today, which is three story 48-foot max height, 21 units there was four in section one. There was a number up in sections two, three, and four. And that totaled, I think, like 298 units. I think the PDD allowed us to do 300.

Mr. Harter - But in the process of doing the zoning change thereafter, as you're mentioning, the most recent one that enabled the buildings and visual assessments were done to allow buildings to get this close to the property line, as you're proposing here.

Mr. Cretekos -Correct. Right. We haven't really changed the clearing or building positioning or heights on this since we went through everything and went through SEQRA in 2018 with the town Board, with the planning board's input, and the following negative declaration. And then that's like SEQRA declaration was also reaffirmed when the planning board did the overall approvals in 2019. And then the town board again reaffirmed the SEQRA neg dec for the project as recently as a couple months ago when they just redid the rezoning again. So again, all of this has been reviewed as part of the SEQRA process vetted. That's why we've provided these graphics, the cross sections showing the impacts. And this is, again, this is the exact same project that was approved three years ago. Now, if we had just broke ground, we wouldn't be here having this conversation. Again, it's the fourth time we're basically here asking for this.

Mr. Harter - I recall when it was in before, and I think it's probably the Valentine Metals project in the home that have gone in here that sparked my attention to this area more so than it was before.

Mr. Cretekos - And I completely understand that. I had the same thought when I first saw those homes being built was I hope they looked at the zoning code for the adjacent property.

Mr. Harter - Well, I appreciate your response. I think it's a big impact, personally.

Chairman Logan - They do show clearing right to the property line, or at least as James was alluding to earlier, fill the property line to get the buildings up a bit from excavation on top. Is that right. And then there's also clearing shown on their drawings.

Mr. Cretekos - I mean, there's some things we could do to potentially maybe limit that. Maybe we could walk the building out more on that side. I know we'll have to talk with the Fire Marshal. Maybe there's some small retaining wall structures that we can do to save more of the hedgerow there and preserve a little bit more, but I think that would.

Mr. Harter - I actually thought you had more property, quite honestly, I thought for some reason you had more to the east than that. And then looking at it. I mean, in order to put your 30 foot away with your building, you've got a storm sewer going through there. By the time you put all your utilities in and everything, there won't be a twig left in that area.

Chairman Logan - Everything existing is shown to be cleared right up to the property line. You look at the aerial and Wes has been sort of scrolling through on.

Mr. Cretekos - Would you mind going back to the overall color rendering?

Mr. Harter - The green that you show east of the buildings is.

Chairman Logan - There's probably 20ft on either side of the property line that has trees anyway, so.

Mr. Harter - Well, on the neighbor's property. 20ft of it on the neighbor's property. Yeah, there's some vegetation on the neighbor's property.

Chairman Logan - Right. I'm just saying it's not a big buffer. Once you clear the 20ft on the one side on the woods of Valentown side, what's remaining is probably 20ft buried of trees.

Mr. Harter - And so you can see the hedgerow appearing right there. The foreground viewpoint is further to the east looking through that hedgerow. So, it's a little deceptive when you're looking through that tree right into the next row of trees is going to be removed. But you know, I would recommend, if anybody's as interested as I am on the board, drive down Valentown Road and take a look at that thing. I mean, you can see the, you can see the office buildings quite easily

because it's a leaf off condition right now. But you don't have to be an engineer to take a look at that and figure out that's going to be very, very visible.

Mr. Cretekos - It's the same visibility we've been presenting for years though. It's the same one that's been approved, that's been vetted by SEQRA, so. And I appreciate your comments, Scott, but at the same point it is. I mean, the project basically cruxes all the sections on this, crux on the economics and the viability of this. So a single section like this not working kind of throws a big monkey wrench in there. And I really think that again, we've already went through this with SEQR and there's already been a negative declaration on visual impacts.

Mr. Pettee - The last time that this was changed, we reevaluated SEQR and reaffirmed the negative declaration that was provided previously.

Mr. Harter - So that's water under the bridge, so to speak.

Mr. Pettee - And things are different. The conditions today are different out there. The Valentown Meadows subdivision, that wasn't there back in 2022. So, yeah, there's definitely a change here.

Ms. Turner - No. I'm sure I missed a large portion of the time. Has anyone else from that community come forward and expressed similar concerns of seeing it.

Chairman Logan - Well, it's just a public hearing, so I know there's at least one or two people here that are from the public in the area. And I certainly would be glad to hear them at this meeting when I get to that point. Anything else? I'll take the advantage. Now, if anyone from the community would like to come up and comment, question.

Francis Rose, Valentown Road

Mr. Rose - So what are you going to do with this water, boss? This water goes right on up through there and starts there, that creek. Okay. And then how close are you to this property line? That's my sister's property line. And there isn't a heck of a lot of room in here. Right here, you got a concrete wall for the property line, been there for years. And there isn't much room between these and that property line because I've mowed all the way up to it as far as I can. Francis, is this your property right there?

Chairman Logan - He's number eight, or lot eight on that side.

Mr. Rose - Oh, you're right there, huh? That's what I told that guy right there, when he said he bought it to find out if he owned all this, and he said he did.

Mr. Clement - He does not.

Mr. Rose - I didn't think so, because I know better. All right? So anyhow, I'm more concerned about that. But like I said, there is not much room here. I don't know how you're going to do all that, because right over here there was a guy that built a house and he built too close to the property line. He couldn't get into his darn garage. We had problems with him, we took care of him. And that's my main concern. That water does not stop flowing. Yesterday there was steam rolling off in that steam. Steam was rolling off. That water was moving so fast and it was so cold. And my great grandfather wanted to know. If it froze or 30 below. One time my father says, no, it's running. So, I just want to know what we're going to do because that water runs right in through there. You going to put a pipe all the way down through till it connects there. That's my main concern. Don't pollute that creek that feeds my cows. And then you said you're going to put the storm water into here, that's going to flow into here and that flows into there. And I think right now this thing is not working properly because right there is wet now and it never used to be. And I had him raise it up because it was flowing over. I had Victor Water management come. Benedict, he came and saw the water running right over. So, he had an all deployment build it up. Because originally the engineer had it lower and Rainaldi wouldn't do anything about it. And they said, well, I've already talked to the DEC and they said put more water dirt there. But they went through the proper channels and built that. But now I think it's undermining. That pond right there is undermining because it's wet right there in that corner. And it never was.

Chairman Logan - As I recall, on that subdivision, the Valentown Meadows. That pond was I believe included as part of remediation. And I'm trying to shoot from the hip here, but some of that was addressed during that. So, I don't know if this impacts it directly or not, but we'll have them take a look at it while we're looking at the rest of the site. Thank you, Mr. Rose. Appreciate your comments.

David Wright, 33 Ketchum St. with Victor hiking Trails.

Mr. Wright - I want to let the owner of the property know that we appreciate the ability to put some trails in on the road opposite the apartments. Back in 2022 or 2023 when this was approved originally we did go back in there with Parks and Recreation and looked at possible trails there. It is a steep slope. There are some hills and valleys there. We would want to make sure that the trails are sustainable. They don't have washouts. And we'd like to make sure that the trails are suitable for bicycles, mountain bikes as well as pedestrians. Do appreciate that. The other thing is sidewalks versus natural pathways. I didn't really see anything in section 2, 3 and 4 that showed any pathways. So if they could show something on the plans so that we know where they're going to be for the residents. I look at that and I see all the office buildings on the top and I see

all the potential residents down on the bottom. And we know that people like to get out and walk and we want to make sure they are safe when they are walking out there.

Chairman Logan - I believe we'll see the next three sections coming I believe we'll see the remaining three sections coming forward.

Mr. Wright - I already have the pamphlet or the plans for that already. The other thing was when we were looking at where to park, if we could have a parking area along this area, we were thinking right on the corner here with the driveway coming off of the, not Valentown, but the High Point Drive there. We didn't actually physically go there and look at the slope. I think we thought it was fairly flat at that location. But we are open to parking anywhere along there. That makes sense. Again, making it safe.

Chairman Logan - Sounds like James was talking. Like that would be a feasible thing to do.

Francis Clement, Lot 8, Valentown Road.

Mr. Clement - I appreciated Scott's comments. From where I am supposed to build that is heavily visible and I appreciate you taking that into account. I've got my wife, my three kids. We have to build a little bit up on an elevation. We're supposed to take down a few trees and we're right behind that old house. So, we're going to be up a little bit and I would appreciate privacy as best as possible with technology now. And I just don't want anyone looking in my house. Got little kids, I purchased that lot because I wanted privacy and I have concerns. I didn't come here to be a bad guy or anything like that. I respect people's desire to build and to create opportunities for other people. I wish we could pick that whole apartment thing up and just move it on the other side. Bring those trees on the other side, on the right side, just get them further away from us. That's just personally how I feel. These homes are extremely expensive. We're supposed to be spending over a million bucks to build this thing. And I have concerned about my property values as well.

Chairman Logan - I'm probably the only one on the board that was here when this development came forward. And originally they had a couple of office buildings proposed here which got eliminated pretty quickly. One office building up here, which is James alluded to, is gone. It would have been building 400 in favor of residential. But these townhouses have been on there almost since the beginning. The steep slopes that Dave Wright just alluded to for the hiking trails was talking about would have made it very difficult, if not impossible, to build without relocating the road. Mr. Rose, I'll get to you in a minute. And so, the site was approved with the road where it is and the townhomes as they are. So I can't argue with Mr. Rose at the moment. But there was a slightly different variation on these. I think it was changed. James. I don't recall. It was 2018, 2019, something like that.

Mr. Cretkos - When we did the PDD.

Chairman Logan - So that would have been the only change. It's been that way since then, before we approved these lots in this area. And I believe yours would have been the same subdivision. So, I certainly appreciate your concern about visibility. I don't know which lot is yours specifically or where your house lines up on. And where is your house going?

Mr. Clement - I'm supposed to share the same driveway as the old house. And I just branch off deeper into the pot.

Chairman Logan - Your view is like somewhere around here.

Mr. Clement - It's a bit elevated. So, yeah, we got about 5.9 acres there. I can appreciate that. This was approved before there were other homes. Wondering whether it is possible for matters to be reconsidered in light of the fact that they had their opportunity to build, they did not build. Land was approved for single family homes and building has begun. We jumped on our opportunity that and what we decide here will probably affect other projects going forward. You already know that homes are scarce now. They're not making more land. So now we're dealing with situations where, you know, it's business or families.

Chairman Logan - I can totally sympathize with your approach or your concerns.

Mr. Rose - Upper right hand corner. All right. Originally, Fred Rainaldi came to me, and that right. That right there is office buildings. That up there was light industry. That was the original plan. Then when he submitted it, he flashed a Kodak moment.

Chairman Logan - He put townhomes here because the board, and I was on the board at the time, requested a transition between offices and residential.

Mr. Rose - He said he didn't know whether the town. I pressed him on it when he had that little slide because it just went bum, bum, boom real fast. And I nailed him afterwards. And he said, well, I don't think the office building is going to work. So, I got to put the townhouses in.

Chairman Logan - Well, it wasn't going to work because the board didn't want them to have an office building in your backyard.

Mr. Rose - Well, like I said, that was supposed to be light industry up there.

Chairman Logan - I appreciate the thought about the original. That's before the board got a hold of it and said, this is what we want to revise.

Mr. Rose - I hate to tell you this, young man, but you aren't going to be happy. I'm a working farm, and I do spread manure there. You will smell it. My sister lives here over the hill, and she can smell it.

Chairman Logan - If you're moving into farming country, unfortunately, that's the way.

Mr. Cretekos – Dave Wright, you are correct. There are the only trails we have on the section two through four plans right now are the ones along the road and then in the right of way for the connection. The rest of the trails, we do need to add those. Those are going to get added between preliminary and final. I was thinking maybe we'll just set up a meeting with you guys and then we can talk trails for the whole project with us. The next comment about the stormwater runoff that Francis had, talking about the tributary that basically runs through our property. If you guys recall, back as part of this project, we had to build this drive stub. This required a bunch of fills over top of that stream. There is an existing culvert in there. As part of that, we had to do constructed wetlands, mitigation and monitoring. That's been done for, I think, over 10 years now. This was something that was done when we built High Point Drive back in the early 2012 or so. So, the monitoring I think was actually done before we even went through the PDD modifications. If I'm not mistaken. Runoff from our developed areas of our site, as you guys all well know, we're basically collecting it all in storm sewers, taking it to our infiltration basin and that's going to manage the runoff from us as well as you know, the developed areas of this are going to end up in the stormwater facility to do the typical detain and release at slow rates.

And the hydrology and everything is in our updated engineers report for sections two through four. Basically, you know, big reductions at the time and the 100 year, the extreme storms. Stormwater out of Stormwater facility B actually goes across the street into the parcel that's still retained by Fred that has kind of like a low sump pit. It almost acts like a giant level spreader and that thing over tops over a big long riprap spillway. And then that goes into I think the tributary of around Auburn Creek and then that runs down south, you know, over behind Beer Project and stuff like that. That facility I know for a fact that we do yearly inspections on that forefront.

So as far as my understanding is it's in maintained shape. Anytime there's an issue with it, it gets corrected. So as far as I'm aware, all the stormwater facilities for this project are functioning as intended. I'm not sure about other issues that Fred might have helped Francis out with over here. That was something that was resulting from us, but I'm unaware of that.

And then the last thing I do want to kind of just point out is I know, I appreciate Francis Clement's comments as well too. He's talking about his one property. But to keep into

consideration, we are creating a number of for sale townhouse lots for this as well as a number of additional apartments. So, creating 255 residential units in the Town of Victor where housing is a need and is important. Whereas something like not having section one get re approved for what we had kind of always assumed that was basically just continuing to get it reapproved until we were ready to build it is something, you know, critical to making this project work.

Chairman Logan - Okay, well, I guess to wrap up this conversation this evening because we're not really, we're not prepared to, I believe, act on a resolution for this, I will make a couple of requests. One, if you could provide an aerial view of where the lower of the two townhomes buildings are and showing Valentown Road and High Point so that we can see exactly where the tree line is relative to where that building is. I'd like to see. I mean this is nice. I mean it shows lots of green and stuff, but it's hard to see what's actually out there. If you can show an aerial of this area and you know, include it across the street. Let's zoom in and see where's the property line on the actual trees that are there. Most recently of an aerial as you can get off of Google Earth perhaps, or what's the other one you can now use? Eagle View

Mr. Cretkos - And just really quick reference for where our buildings kind of sit. So these two buildings, we have a 20-foot setback on this property. The northern building sits 35ft at both corners away from that. This Southern building sits 35ft from the property here and 60ft from the property here.

Chairman Logan - That would be helpful to see like rectangles, a property line and say here's to the property line you've shown as being cleared. And then you've got fill and everything else. Just to get an idea of what's actually the real vegetation looks like.

Mr. Cretkos - And that's something too. I think I would want to talk with Paul Graham, the fire marshal, because one of the things that we always were trying to provide in the rear of the building was we had to have fill at a certain elevation so that they could let their ground ladders get up to the balcony. So we were always filling on the back of that building where we had always wanted to walk it out. So, what we have now is kind of an agreement that we had with the fire marshal on that. So, maybe again kind of alluding to if we can walk this out more with that and then maybe there's some ability to do a retaining wall to save some trees and enhance that buffer a little bit.

Chairman Logan - I guess that's my concern is if we can show what we can see, exactly what's being trimmed. Because right now we can show it on a green. I guess it doesn't really show actual trees, but I mean, perhaps there's an opportunity to add some green greenery here near this pond, to add some buffer at the south end. I don't think you can do much between the building and north.

Mr. Cretekos - You don't have too much views like when you're down here because of how much the slope comes up to the top of that pond and the existing elevation, you're really. Your views are going to be from this bend here looking up. Those are where your view. I totally get what you're saying.

Chairman Logan - A sense of what actually is going to be done. I know we've approved it all in the past and all that, but we've got news. New residents and older residents that both, I think have expressed a concern.

Mr. Cretekos - Would you guys be able to put us on the agenda in two weeks then? So that way we can still have this conversation before sections two through four.

Mr. Harter - James, I had just a final question for you, which is what Joe said. I noticed that you didn't use a walkout on the east side. And I thought that seems a little strange given the steep slope that you have there. But you mentioned the fire department. Maybe you want to access around or something like that.

Mr. Cretekos - So when we had the 21 unit apartment buildings, part of all the agreements we had with the fire marshal for safety and security, the fire systems, you know, standpipes in the stairwells for hose connections, things of that nature, one of the main things that they were concerned about was being able to get a ladder off the back of the building up to the third story balconies for access. So they had a max height that we needed to do. Basically, I think it was a four foot walk out from what the front finish grade was the max that we could do to let them get up there. And we were just trying to carry that seem methodology.

Mr. Harter - If you were able to appease them and be allowed to do a walkout from a fire perspective, then you could really reduce the slope that you show there, matching into the property line significantly and conserve more vegetation that way. You could add plantings, whereas I don't think you can add plantings. They're going to do much on a one or two slope.

Chairman Logan - Scott, I'll just add that I believe that's the side where the parking garage is. I don't think there's any apartments that do walkouts on that side or could do a walkout. Yeah.

Mr. Cretekos - So only thing we're walking out is the building basically right now the. Where you kind of sit in the garage, you come in at this elevation and the finish grade on the back sits up here. If we could walk it out at least at the bottom of that garage or maybe even, you know, extended footers or something to get it down another foot or two. But you're 100% right. That is something that we can do. It should allow us to kind of minimize that grading because it does come up, I think like 10ft or something.

Chairman Logan - I mean, you could lower the grading like James was alluding to, and that's not a bad idea. And then you could do some plantings.

Mr. Cretekos - I don't want to commit to that without talking to the fire marshal.

Mr. Harter - I understand. I've been down this road before with projects of my own, so I know what you're talking about. But it did jump out at me and I thought, well, there must be a reason for that.

Chairman Logan - So if we could maybe have you take a look at screening foliage, whatever trees that we could do, and adjusting the grade Scott perhaps suggested then that might go.

Mr. Cretekos - It's not going to be a big lift to look at that. Just conceptually. I can have a quick conversation with Bob Graham and just get something over on tissue. And obviously if we can get something tissue wise that good enough to get you guys approved, we obviously will get the plans updated and we can have labella do the final, final blessing as we kind of work through the rest of the section.

Chairman Logan - So those are the couple of things I was interested in was to try to address the concerns or view shed opposite the apartments on that side or townhouses. Anything else from anyone. So, I guess unless there's something else. We have an opportunity to close the public hearing. Would anybody like to offer a motion to close 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 - Public hearings closed on this particular application from section one. Thank you both for your comments and we certainly will be looking at them and address them going forward. If you have any other concerns, please send them to the planning department. And we certainly can look at them down the road. But look forward to seeing you as a resident in Victor and I hope you're happy here.

So, with that, the only other thing I had on the agenda actually wasn't technically part of the agenda, but Lisa sent, or at least the town sent everyone notices for training. That needs to be taken care of. There's like five or six at least of them. They're 15 to 30 minutes or something like that. You have the ability to get them done by the end of March 28, I think was the date. I just want to bring your attention to that. Take care of them as you can over the next month or so and believe that's it.

CENTOLA SITE PLAN

34-SP-2025

Baker Road

Zoned – Residential

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.

Chairman Logan – This application has been removed until next meeting

LEHIGH PLACE PDD PRELIM & FINAL SUBDIVISION

03-PS-2025, 03-FS-2025

200 Victor Height Parkway

Zoned – PDD

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 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 next 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 next 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.

TOWN OF VICTOR PLANNING BOARD

January 27, 2026

Chairman Logan – This application has been removed until next meeting

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 next meeting

Motion was made by Scott Harter, seconded by Joe Limbeck, RESOLVED the meeting was adjourned at 9:26 PM.

Lisa Boughton, Secretary

