

another alternative to the rolled stone at the end of the drainage pipe to avoid removal of the round stone by drainage flows. A current survey should be provided.

CPN-013-17

The DiMarco Group (attention: Paul Colucci), 1950 Brighton–Henrietta Town Line Road, Rochester, N.Y. 14623; and BME Associates, 10 Lift Bridge Lane East, Fairport, N.Y. 14450, representing Gregory Westbrook, 3316 West Lake Road, Canandaigua, N.Y. 14424, owner of property at 3000 County Road 10

TM #84.00-1-19	24.282 acres
TM #84.00-1-20.11	18.383 acres
TM #84.00-1-20.12	28.413 acres
TM #84.00-1-43.1	16.194 acres

Simultaneous Preliminary Overall Site Plan Approval and Final Site Plan Approval for Phase 1 to construct 36 affordable living apartment buildings (8 units per building) for a total of 288 units and a proposed clubhouse; and to construct 12 market-rate apartment buildings (8 units per building) for a total of 96 units and a proposed clubhouse.

Ms. Marthaller noted that the current Site Plan may be revised by the Planning Board and by other agencies, and that a project of this scope is still in the early design and review stages. She suggested that perhaps the ECB may wish to postpone its review until a future version of the Site Plan becomes available or have the opportunity to review a version that would reflect subsequent revisions.

It was noted that the Planning Board will hold a workshop specifically upon this application on Wednesday, March 29, 2017, at 5:30 p.m. (one hour prior to the regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting) and that ECB members may wish to attend to receive further details from the applicant and consultants.

Among the issues discussed by Ms. Marthaller were the references on the Site Plan to the “Environmental Site Assessment” and the “Cultural Resources Investigation Report.” She requested definitions of these terms and details about their inclusion on the Site Plan.

Ms. Marthaller also discussed the access driveway into the apartment complex off Route A as shown on the Site Plan, and noted that this appears to be the only entrance into Phase 1 of the project. She said that this would bring vehicular traffic into a driveway with parking on both sides. She questioned the ingress and egress of vehicular traffic and the safety issues regarding a single access.

Ms. Marthaller also discussed landscaping, the number of new trees proposed for planting, and the incorporation of walking trails.

Mr. Damann suggested that trails be installed to align with potential sidewalks from the development to Routes 5&20 to the south with Ontario Pathways to the north. He also suggested that the applicant consider green infrastructure techniques.

Ms. Marthaller noted that Ms. Hooker provided written comments on this application, as follows:

“This seems to me like a very dense and regimented site layout and I am curious how each development parcel compares Brookside Apartments in terms of units per acre. The building spacing in the market rate portion appears to allow for more generous open space than that in the affordable part of the project, and I question whether this is appropriate in the context of a mixed income development project. However, these are mainly matters for the Planning Board. The ECB’s interest is mainly in the fifth parcel, including the wetland areas, the stormwater management areas, and the open space area (playground?) identified with the words “proposed access road.” The whole business of who will own and manage this land and how the wetlands will be protected should be ironed out prior to the Site Plan approval.

“The DEC letter identifies several wetland areas on the site (B, C, E, G, N and Q) as regulated wetlands and notes that no development should occur on them or within 100 feet without DEC approval. However, the map attached to the DEC letter only shows some of these, and does not identify the 100-foot setback line. If we don’t already have one, I suggest that the ECB ask for a more complete map (overlaid with the project Site Plan) that would allow us to better understand where the boundaries of the sensitive wetlands and their buffer zones are for our use (and the Planning Board’s) in discussing the disposition of this portion of the site.

“Lastly, there is some mention in earlier documents about the possibility of sidewalks linking the property to the County Road 10/Routes 5&20 intersection. This is very desirable and should be confirmed prior to site plan approval if it is feasible.”

ECB Comments: The ECB would like the opportunity to review a subsequent set of site plans following the initial Planning Board review and revisions by the applicant. The applicant should consider safety concerns and vehicular traffic ingress and egress into a driveway with parking on both sides, the incorporation of green infrastructure, the establishment of trails linking to Ontario Pathways to the north, the installation of sidewalks leading toward the County Road 10/Routes 5&20 intersection to the south, and the submission of a map consistent with the DEC comment letter. The ECB also expresses concern to assure that the adjacent wetland is accurately delineated.