

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

B R I G H T O N
P L A N N I N G
B O A R D

September 16th, 2020
At approximately 7:00 **p.m.**
Brighton Town Hall Zoom meeting
2300 Elmwood Avenue
Rochester, New York 14618

PRESENT:

WILLIAM PRICE, CHAIRPERSON

PAMELA DELANEY)	
JOHN J. OSOWSKI)	
LAURA CIVILETTI)	BOARD MEMBERS
DAVID FADER)	
JASON BABCOCK-STINER)	

DAVID DOLLINGER, ESQ.
Town Attorney

RAMSEY A. BOEHNER
Town Planner

NOT PRESENT:
JAMES WENTWORTH

REPORTED BY: RHODA COLLINS, Court Reporter
FORBES COURT REPORTING SERVICES, LLC
21 Woodcrest Drive
Batavia, New York 14020

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Good evening, everyone. Welcome to the September 16th, meeting of the Town of Brighton Planning Board. This is a live virtual meeting and as such, we will be inviting folks to participate via either Zoom or whatever platform you are on.

We will be hearing several hearings tonight, several have been postponed to our October meeting, and we will let you know which of those they are.

I would like to start, many of you may be able to see the names of our Board members, but I would like to introduce the Board. We have Laura Civiletti, Jason Babcock-Stiner, John Osowski, Pam Delaney, David Fader and tonight we are missing James Wentworth. He is absent tonight. We will be doing a roll call, but I did want to just introduce the Board members to everybody.

It's a little bit of a shortened agenda from what was published tonight due to some postponements. Again, we will ask the individual applicants to make a brief statement about their application, go through the mechanics of the site plan, and any approvals they are seeking. The Board will then have the ability to ask the applicant and their represents any questions. And then as we open up the Public Hearing we will ask individuals interested in talking

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

about a project to raise their hand. My understanding, the raise hand function is either in the participant's window at the bottom of your screen or the reactions window.

If for some reason neither of those work for you, just waive your hand frantically and Jeff Frisch or Ramsey Boehner will look to help you.

And I apologize, I did not mention, Jeff and Ramsey both with the Town, and our Planning Board attorney is David Dollinger, David is on as well, and we are being recorded by Rhoda Collins.

So let's begin with a roll call, Mr. Secretary, will you please call the roll for tonight.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Osowski?

MR. OSOWSKI: Here.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Babcock-Stiner?

MR. BABCOCK-STINER: Here.

MR. BOEHNER: Ms. Delaney?

MS. DELANEY: Here.

MR. BOEHNER: Ms. Civiletti?

MS. CIVILETTI: Here.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Fader?

MR. FADER: Here.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Price?

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Here.

MR. BOEHNER: Absent is Wentworth.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Thank you. Was everybody able to receive and open the August 19th, meeting minutes?

ALL MEMBERS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Okay. I will accept a motion to approve those, unless somebody has edits or revisions.

MR. OSOWSKI: Basically, I noticed that it said the start time was 7:30, I believe we started at 7:05 a right on the front cover page. That is the only correction I have.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Okay. We have a motion with that edit. Was there a second?

MR. BABCOCK-STINER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Ramsey, will you call the roll.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Price?

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Yes.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Fader?

MR. FADER: Yes.

MR. BOEHNER: Ms. Civiletti?

MS. CIVILETTI: Yes.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

MR. BOEHNER: Ms. Delaney?

MS. DELANEY: I was absent last month.

MR. BOEHNER: You abstain?

MS. DELANEY: Yes.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Babcock-Stiner?

MR. BABCOCK-STINER: Yes.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Osowski?

MR. OSOWSKI: Yes.

MR. BOEHNER: Motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Thank you. Mr. Secretary, can you confirm that tonight's Public Hearings were properly advertised.

MR. BOEHNER: Yes. The Public Hearings were properly advertised in the Brighton-Pittsford Post of September 10, 2020.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Thank you. We will hear those. Let me just for the audience tell you the applications that were postponed until our October 21st, meeting. That includes 8P-01-20, application of John Greer, for preliminary and final site plan approval at 2171 West Henrietta Road; Application 8P-02-20, application of Passero Associates agent for New Monroe Real Estate, LLC for site plan modification at 2816 Monroe Avenue; Application

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

8P-03-20, application of Passero Associates, agent for RFM Morgan Properties for a site plan modification at 2125 Monroe Avenue.

Those three are postponed until October, as is, under new business 9P-NB1-20 the application of the Baptist Bible Temple and Clover Park Properties, for the application at 1075 Clover Street.

That's said now, the first application up tonight is 9P-01-20.

APPLICATION 9P-01-20

9P-01-20 Application of Nicholas Leonardo, owner, for Site Plan Modification and woodlot EPOD permit modification (9P-01-19 & 1P-01-20) to remove additional trees for the purpose of constructing a new house on property located west of the intersection of Clover Street and Greenaway Road, known as Tax ID #s 122.16-1-5, 122.16-1-4 and 122.16-1-3. All as described on application and plans on file.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Is there anybody here to represent Nick Leonardo?

MR. BOEHNER: I see Nicholas's phone, I will unmute him.

NICHOLAS LEONARDO: Hi.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

MR. BOEHNER: Are you on? And maybe Greg McMahon or G. McMahon.

NICHOLAS LEONARDO: Yes, I am on the call, I'm Nick Leonardo, and also Greg McMahon and also Josh Daley, our arborist who prepared the documents for tonight's meeting.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Okay. Nick, would you just give us a brief background? Maybe Greg can help you out with what the original approval was and why the modifications at this point.

NICHOLAS LEONARDO: So we were already approved back originally last year for our site plan, and then we had a DBA, and then we moved the house, and then we had a modification, it was then we approved at the time.

Upon which, we in the meantime have changed builders, we're going with Sortino Properties. And upon examining the property with the excavating team, as well as the engineer, as well as the builder, we felt there was going to be a larger impact to some of the surrounding trees. And if you look at the report that Josh prepared, those would be the Category 1 trees that would have a larger impact that are immediately surrounding the house.

Then, in addition to some of the other trees, I know there are some additional trees that are kind of

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

decaying on the property. You can see that and Josh can talk about that a little bit. And within that, there are some trees in the lot that are just very, very large and we just felt that, you know, looking at the rest of the neighborhood, the average trees in the yards and the houses are about two or three trees per house.

And in the original site plan we would about 90 tree on our property, so it really doesn't fit the rest of the neighborhood. As well as some other concerns like hazard and decaying trees, things of that nature, we thought it would be better for us to remove these trees and plant new trees and to just have a more landscaped property that is going to be more fitting for the neighborhood, and safer for us and for the environment. And Josh can probably talk a little bit better on the trees themselves.

JOSH DALEY: Yes, I apologize.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: No, please go ahead, Josh.

JOSH DALEY: All right. Thanks for having us. And, yeah, I examined and assessed Mr. Leonardo's property. I believe there's about 120 trees overall and we're looking to remove about 91. My report show about 49 trees are pretty objectively ready for removal, either in a place where the building will be, or showing decay, or structural issues, or

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

will be disturbed as they are closer in ten feet to the house.

So the remaining trees, so there's definitely a more subjective opinion on that, but without a constructive treatment technician plan in place, the construction can definitely disturb those trees. There's two large black walnuts that are good examples. They are not known to survive construction well, they're large and after the construction they will be more exposed then they were currently and, you know, more subjective to wind.

So some trees tolerate construction well, even though it looks like they may not, but, you know, speculation that they will show stress and decline is not unusual. And replanting, I think, is a more sure way to have healthy, sound trees and, you know, again, match the neighborhood with more attractive landscape trees, rather than, you know, what are also a lot of secondary growth trees, invasive trees, like Norway maple and mulberry.

So again, there's definitely arguments for some of these trees and, you know, ultimately I think applying the appropriate town codes will be the best guidance.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Josh, could you give us a

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

little background on yourself?

JOSH DALEY: Yeah. So I'm a Board certified master arborist, been practicing agriculture for over 20 years, moved to the area about a year ago with my family, my wife is from the area. Previously of working here and starting my business as a consult, I supervised tree work for Central Park, for the Central Park Conservancy. And so, you know, it's a park with 40 million visitors a year and, you know, roughly 20,000 trees. Risk was our number one concern and number two was tree preservation and the culture and history of the park.

So that's still how I apply my practice, you know, I definitely don't look to remove trees, but my experience is also that with infrastructure and conflicts, you know, it's -- unless you have a really special tree or a unique habitat or environment, a lot of the times -- and I believe this applies at Mr. Leonardo's place -- you know, a handful of nice oak trees, beyond that a lot of those trees, you know, they're just urban volunteer trees.

And again, that has a place as far as habitat, ecology, and storm runoff and all that benefits trees. But I think when building a house and trying to preserve these trees, which, you know, and individuals are not showing any

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

really unique qualities and can be replaced, I think it's worth the discussion.

So, you know, right now I practice consulting arbor culture, I have my own business. I was living in Brighton for the first year, we recently moved to Penfield. But we intend to stay and my goal is definitely advocating for trees and their successful cohabitation with people, and in these areas.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Okay, thank you, appreciate that. I just wanted to understand your professional background. So would you say that -- you say there's 49 trees that you or reasons as -- which could be structurally related, but if my math is anywhere near correct, it's telling us there are 41 trees that are more subjective as far as which you're proposing to remove.

Now, of those, can you tell me what the majority of those trees are? Are they majority, all volunteer Norway maples? What, let's call it, mature hardwood forest trees are in there?

JOSH DALEY: Sure, okay. So just to get the numbers right, there's about 120, what we would call, you know, large trees above a shrub or a sapling on the property.

Mr. Leonardo would like to remove 91, so 49,

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

you know, again, trying to be objective, primary removals again, next to the building, in place of the building, that remains, 42 remain. And 26 are non-native and invasive, primarily Norway maple and white mulberry, so 26 of the 42. That leaves 16, and 11 of those trees are under eight inches in diameter, so not major trees.

Most of the remaining trees, there's a grove of sassafras trees, but, you know, those are typically sharing a root system. A number of those have failed, you know, sassafras are not long lived trees. And, you know, there's going to be work around them, and there's a few that are dead and, you know, should be removed anyway. So, you know, when you're talking about a grove like that, selectively removing a number of individuals is not always a great practice.

There's I think, where is it, you know, the probably the, what you might call the best trees, to the northeast I think it's like removal number 10 and 11, those are pretty nice red oaks. In here I reference them and talk about how according to International Society of Arboriculture best management practices, the topsoil stockpile will impact their critical root zone.

So, you know, and that's the kind of thing

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

1
2
3 where, you know, if the stockpile is strictly adhered to and
4 nothing accesses it north of it those trees will probably be
5 okay. But in the construction zone and without a really
6 strict tree protection plan, you know, construction zones,
7 you know, they're trying to get work done and, you know,
8 that's kind of one of those things where it raises concerns.
9 And, you know, that's a challenge, it's pure speculation.

10 And when Mr. Leonardo asked me to justify
11 these, you know, this is one where I told him I'm kind of on
12 the fence. It's hard to know exactly how the construction
13 will go. The trees are nice, you know, but in addition,
14 further landscape, sometimes people put berms up along
15 railroads, you know, so that also comes into play, you know,
16 not just strict construction of the building, you know, but
17 how the site will look after.

18 So, you know, I fully agree that some of these
19 trees are, you know, it's -- the guidelines I would have
20 given are a little bit gray. And I am not trying to
21 straddled Mr. Leonardo's interest and then my own, you know,
22 professional opinion. And these I can clearly say, you know,
23 I get, they could be stressed but, you know, they might also
24 be fine. So besides those though, most of the others, you
25 know, there's a handful of Norway maples that are mature.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

And, you know, but seeing the site and walking through it, trying to picture it, it's -- a lot of these trees just weren't trees I was going to chain myself to, if that makes sense.

So, you know, this is -- your process is new to me, I'm not so familiar with the forestry management plan and all of the codes. So definitely I yield to you guys on that, but that's kind of where I'm at. I hope that makes sense.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Okay, thank you. I think, I guess, let me, I'm going to pass on to others and see if they have any other questions. Laura, do you have any questions about this?

MS. CIVILETTI: No. I think, specifically, are there any trees worth trying to preserve within that work area that's defined on the plan?

JOSH DALEY: In my opinion, just, the nicest tree fortunately was outside of the work zone. It's a gorgeous red oak on the northwest corner. The oaks are what would be, you know, what I would call the most worthy of preserving. But again, they're going to be impacted and I don't know how exactly, you know, I can't tell you where the backhoe is going to go. I can't tell you.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

So, those are along the north side, those are what, you know, the nicest looking trees, the most ecologically, you know, most contributions, native trees, not invasive. And most of the rest of the trees, you know, at least the ones that I didn't think were the primary reasons for removal, objectively ought to go.

There's actually it's one big black cherry that is in the right of way, it's kind of a neat black cherry, for what it's worth. But there's not a lot of trees in there that I really saw that didn't have really objective reasons for removal that I thought, boy, that's a real shame to see that tree go.

You know, I think they can be replaced, I think a better selection, you know, for landscaping value, or ecological value. And again, these trees, you know, without a real protection plan, looking at the critical zone, you know, if they do die in a few years, it would be a challenge to get them out. You know, these are on the backside of the property and, you know, and they -- so now does it make sense as far as a practical standpoint?

MS. CIVILETTI: But we do have the opportunity here to implement a protection plan if there are trees that should be protected.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

JOSH DALEY: So I guess I'm caught in the middle here. You know, I know Mr. Leonardo's preference and, you know, I probably would need just better objective guidelines, if that makes sense, looking to a town code, again. I'm kind of at the end of the arguments I can make.

At this point, it's my opinion versus Mr. Leonardo's opinion, and I'm representing him, you know, there's that. So I guess -- does that make sense, I don't have a great answer for that.

MS. CIVILETTI: Yes.

JOSH DALEY: There's nothing that I look at and say, oh my God, how can they cut that down? And I'm trying to keep a level head of an arborist advocating for the trees, but also understanding that development is going to take place. And short of cordoning this area off and saying it is a park or, lack of a better word, that, you know, removing and replanting when these trees probably will be disturbed. And even if the root system is protected, you're moving the trees around, you're changing drainage patterns, you're changing the soil. That stuff can still cause issues, and so, that's -- I'm treading a line. I'm trying to find more objective reasons, and I don't have a good one where it's done.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

MS. CIVILETTI: So, not trying to put you on the hook between yourself and the client, but I think we need to understand what's, you know, realistically practical to preserve here.

MR. BOEHNER: Josh, did you review the approved plan by the Planning Board? Because what's happening here is the area disturbance, we did have a tree protection plan. All trees that were supposed to remain were supposed to be protected and fenced off, with no construction activity, no stockpile allowed in those areas.

It seems as if the area of disturbance or the area of construction is expanding. Is that correct? I'm trying to understand why when we first did this, we were not told when the construction of the house was going to be done, that it was going to kill all these trees.

NICHOLAS LEONARDO: Well, Ramsey, just to point out, there's a lot of trees that were in the original site plan that were not marked for removal that are inside the area of disturbance. I think to Josh's point, he could correct me if I'm wrong, but even if you put plastic around a tree, I can't imagine that when there's a tree ten feet from the house, that the roots are not going to be underneath that area.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

These are -- some of these trees on the site, original site plan, are very close to the house still, that were inside of the construction zone originally, but not necessarily marked for removal. So I think that's kind of what Josh is saying and he can correct me if I'm wrong.

Now, when you get outside of the impacted zone, you know, that's where I think, some of speculation and some of the trees that are, you know, we're trying to remove come into play. One of my questions was, because I couldn't find it anywhere in the Town Code, what are the specific Town Codes in relation to removing trees on not a town property, but an individual's property? I've got to imagine there are some guidelines set aside for residential properties and tree removal.

MR. BOEHNER: Yes. You would want to, and I was going to ask Josh, have you reviewed the Town's environmental protection overlay district woodlot regulations, which cover this property?

JOSH DALEY: I have not.

NICHOLAS LEONARDO: I have read them, but they do not, unless I can't find it, specify specifically what you're allowed or not allowed to remove. All it says in the Town's code is that it would have to be reviewed by the

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

Planning Board and the Conservation Board.

MR. BOEHNER: That's correct. And one of the things they look at is the condition, species, type of the trees, they would also weigh into it what are the mitigation plans for replacing the trees or restoring the woodlot.

That is how regulations work, it's not black and white regulations, it's at the discretion of the Planning Board.

NICHOLAS LEONARDO: Okay. That's what I was kind of wondering. Because I know one of the other factors is obviously hazard and things of that nature. And I think, you know, it is up to you guys ultimately. I know this lot has been empty for a lot of years and it has actually been kind of an area where people have thrown garbage. I've walked this lot many times, there's garbage, there's cinder blocks, there's kids' bikes. It's actually kind of a trash pit currently of stuff. And it's not been maintained by the town or anybody, let alone the right of way, there's falling trees.

So I think our goal is to try to make the area look better. And if we have to plant trees to improve upon the overall landscape of the property then we are open to doing that. Because ideally we're moving to this

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

1
2
3 neighborhood too, because we love the trees. Actually, it's
4 one of the many reasons. But at the same time, I think we
5 have to live in these conditions and, you know, having a
6 hundred trees on a property just seems, you know -- this is
7 not a forested neighborhood, it's the regular subdivision.
8 And many of the houses aren't forested.

9 So I think if we can improve the current
10 landscape, it would be a much better benefit not only to us,
11 but also to the town and the neighborhood and the neighbors.

12 MR. BOEHNER: How are the trees going to be
13 removed?

14 JOSH DALEY: I didn't hear the first part of
15 that question.

16 MR. BOEHNER: How are the trees going to be
17 removed? Are each stump going to be grinded, stumps going to
18 be left, or are they going to be pulled out?

19 NICHOLAS LEONARDO: I think it was the
20 intention to -- well, I guess right now we haven't actually
21 finalized what the plan is. I mean, if there's a
22 recommendation from the Town, I think we definitely would be
23 open to that. I know inside the construction area they're
24 going to pull all the stumps out. If we're able to pull them
25 out, I'd prefer to do that. If not, and we had to grind them

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

1
2
3 down then, if that's a best practice we would have to do
4 that. I mean, I guess that's going to be what you guys
5 recommended.

6 MR. BOEHNER: Well, we've got to know what you
7 are doing. You need to talk to the arborist, because what's
8 starting to happen, and the concern from the engineering
9 department is that the area of disturbance is now greater
10 than 20,000 square feet. And you're going to need a SWIP.

11 NICHOLAS LEONARDO: Sure, right.

12 MR. BOEHNER: The other thing is, when you did
13 that, we're going to want to see a revised grading plan. So
14 the grading plan was very limited showing the change of
15 grade.

16 NICHOLAS LEONARDO: So I do have another
17 question and maybe this would be best left for the Planning
18 Board, but because this is a woodlot EPOD district
19 technically, if we did proceed with the current trees that
20 are inside of the current site plan, once the house and all
21 construction is completed, and the house has been final
22 grade, what would be the process to then remove the trees
23 later? Would we still have to go back through this process
24 or would we have to get a separate excavation plan with a
25 revised site plan for an excavator to come out and remove the

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

trees that are currently on this plan?

MR. BOEHNER: Because it's an EPOD and within an EPOD district you would have to come back. You could not use the excavation clearing ordinance.

NICHOLAS LEONARDO: Okay.

MR. BOEHNER: It's in an EPOD. It's because it's an EPOD.

NICHOLAS LEONARDO: I understand. So, yeah, I think preferably we would want to get the trees removed now. I mean, we're going through this process right now, logically it makes the most sense then not to keep coming back to the Town with changes and revisions.

I mean, if it would keep us from having to do more excavation and not impact any more environmental, I think grinding down the stumps would be probably a better, you know, obviously a much better option. But again, I have to talk to the arborist and to the engineer and see if that's, you know, that's going to be the best option.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Could we hear from Greg McMahon on the grade on this?

GREG MCMAHON: Sure, Bill. I wouldn't anticipate outside of the current rating plan, again, I wouldn't anticipate any grading changes. It's my

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

understanding that they're just trying to open up, expand the area around the house. We certainly would take a look, but I wouldn't anticipate any grading outside of the area that were currently shown as grading.

Now there would be disturbance certainly with the trees that are removed outside of the grading limits, but that area would, you know, whether they grind the stumps or pull the stumps would be, you know, the topsoil would be there, it would be restored as lawn.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Just back to the existing grade?

GREG MCMAHON: Yeah, there's no -- it's a relatively flat site, as I'm sure you see on the grading plan. So I wouldn't anticipate, you know, any changes in grade would be a matter of inches not feet.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Okay. Greg, is there any reason in your mind that the approved tree protection plan for Phase 1 couldn't apply to any new configuration of the limit of disturbance? That would apply to anything you --

GREG MCMAHON: Sure, yes. Certainly there would be protection on any trees that would be jeopardized by the work. And I rely on -- I have not seen the arborist plan, but if certain trees were pointed out we can certainly

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

modify our protection plan to incorporate, you know, protection. As certainly there's some trees that are so far away or are distance enough that aren't going to be an issue. Yeah, I would not see a problem.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: And as far as stockpiling, stockpiles can move to wherever it's most appropriate and they're not going to, you know, the movement of trucks over and compacting root zones, where you're stockpiling can be relocated so they're out of the way of those trees.

GREG MCMAHON: Yes. We can, again, I was not -- when we located the stockpile up in that northeast corner, you know, I am not anywhere near a tree person here. I, you know, I didn't consider that, but we can certainly relocate the stockpiles. As far as the -- I think a lot of this was precipitated by the builder when he went out there and saw it and what was to remain, I think he raised the first red flag saying, you know, if I'm go to build this house some of these trees that you're proposing to save are not going to survive, I just can't build the house and run my equipment here and have the proper equipment to do the job. So that kind of started this whole thing.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Okay. Other Board members have questions for the team?

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

MR. FADER: I have a couple. Greg, with the new house builder that's coming in, is there a significant change in the disturbed area from the original approved plan?

GREG MCMAHON: Well, I don't think that wasn't precipitated. We never -- in preparing the plan there was never a house builder giving us any input. So the change in builders had really nothing to do, a builder didn't get involved with going in the field and looking at this until after all the plans had been approved. So I don't think the change in the builder had any impact at all on what we're now showing.

MR. FADER: Well, let me ask it a different way. Has the disturbed area changed significantly from the original plan?

GREG MCMAHON: Well, yes. If you consider that removing trees is considered disturbance --

MR. FADER: No. I'm not considering the removal of trees, I mean the construction of the house, the area that's going to be disturbed by the construction of the house, has that changed significantly?

GREG MCMAHON: Not significantly. Pushed it out a little bit in some areas, but not significantly.

MR. FADER: The other question is, how many

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

trees are going to be removed in the original plan?

GREG MCMAHON: I believe 31. I will check here. I believe it was, there were three trees in the town right of way, and a total of 32 trees. So three in the town right of way and nine on the property.

MR. FADER: Well, here's the problem I have with this. You've tripled the amount of trees you're going to remove, even though the amount of disturbance is basically unchanged, so you don't need to triple it.

And you knew going in on this project that you were in a woodlot. And so, you say that the neighborhood isn't forested, and that it is not a park, and that's true, but it was a woodlot, you knew it was a woodlot and you know the Town's thoughts on the woodlot. So I think the number of trees being removed is excessiveness and that's my opinion.

GREG MCMAHON: My question was, and, you know, going through the EPOD, the woodlot EPOD, the one thing I couldn't find, again, I'm a little out of my area here, was the definition of a woodlot. In a lot of towns where, you know, they have woodlot EPODs, but there's a definition of, you know, of what best to be a woodlot to make it a woodlot.

I didn't know, is there something the Town, is there some definition that the Town uses to define trees or?

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

MR. BOEHNER: Yes. It's in the code, an area of one or more acres of vegetation, the majority of woods is classified as replants, whose trunks are greater than three inches in diameter and height, three feet above ground, and whose full height reaches a maximum of six feet.

NICHOLAS LEONARDO: I think, sorry to interrupt --

MR. BOEHNER: This isn't by parcel, it is by area.

NICHOLAS LEONARDO: Yes, by area, we found that out. I think that early on in the process that Greg and myself, even before I even purchased this lot, had no idea that this would be considered a woodlot because, you know, Brighton is one of the few towns that has this in place, to my understanding.

So when we originally went in, we didn't realize we wouldn't be able to remove some of these trees. And I think -- and I understand what you are saying, it is a lot of trees, but, again, it's still residential property. I think subjectively, I understand your job is to protect the trees, but also, I think you want to keep the look of the neighborhood in line with the rest of the neighborhood. If it's a park, then it's a park, or if it's actual woodlot, you

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

1
2
3 know, somewhere that's in the woods. But it's not, it's in
4 an old subdivision.

5 So I just want you to keep in consideration
6 that we're still keeping 30 percent of the trees which is way
7 more than anybody else in our entire neighborhood.

8 And, if you've gone out there and looked at
9 the quality of some of these trees, they just don't look
10 good. They don't look like some of the parks and some of the
11 other wooded lots around it. Again, it has not been well
12 maintained or landscaped, or anything. Even the town right
13 of way has trees that are falling down.

14 So I just would like you to try to consider
15 what we're looking at for long term and what we're trying to
16 accomplish and try to, you know, improve the tree quality not
17 take away from the lot itself.

18 CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Other Board members have
19 questions or comments?

20 MR. BOEHNER: Are trees going to be removed
21 from the right of way?

22 NICHOLAS LEONARDO: Pardon?

23 MR. BOEHNER: Are you proposing to remove any
24 additional trees from the town right of way as part of this?

25 NICHOLAS LEONARDO: We are not, no. Just the

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

ones we have approval for. Basically, just to put it in perspective, most of these trees are within about a 30-foot radius of the house. Our goal was to preserve as many trees within that radius as possible that would not long term impact the house and also overcast the house as well.

Some of the dead and dying trees that are on the current list were not on the original list earlier, which is a chat you and I had, Ramsey, about, you know, a house in the neighborhood had a tree, a dead tree fall on top of it.

I think that was something we probably should have examined, any dead or dying trees earlier on just to make sure there was nothing that could, you know, fall in the future. But in addition, we want to preserve as many trees as possible especially the ones you're going to be able to see from the street, which is what we pretty much did with this plan.

In addition, we are already planting trees but we would like to plant more trees around the property to add better landscaping and to kind of keep the overall look, again, of the neighborhood. I don't think it's our goal to just kill trees, I think we want to improve upon the look of the lot as well as the safety and the environmental.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Other Board members?

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

Jason, John?

MR. OSOWSKI: Yes. I have some comments. So is it reasonable for us to expect perhaps, a comprehensive tree survey that identifies the species of each of these trees? An objective condition assessment of whether it's diseased or dying, an old ash tree that needs to come out and the sizes of these trees. That gives us an objective recommendation from the certified arborist saying which one should come out and which ones shouldn't.

Because, if you look at this plan and you just see remove, remove, remove, remove all over the place, you know, and let's say to the south side of the house, if there's a bunch of trees there, that old Norway maple should come out. And you've got those decedent oak trees at the northeast corner. Well, you move the topsoil stockpile to the south side so you can save those oak trees and not disturb them. And it just looks like there hasn't been a lot of thought to --

NICHOLAS LEONARDO: Has everyone on the Board reviewed the arborist's plans, the photos of the lot? We provided this to the Town about two weeks ago. There's a full report already that's been done that the Town should have had a chance to review.

1 BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

2
3 CHAIRPERSON PRICE: I have not read that.

4 NICHOLAS LEONARDO: I sent it to Ramsey, as
5 well as Rick, and so the Conservation Board could see this
6 report. And, you know, my frustration is, before I even got
7 a response, no one even reviewed the plan and here we are at
8 the meeting and it still hasn't been reviewed by anyone. So
9 I'm a little surprised that that information wasn't shared
10 with the rest of the Board.

11 Because I think that was our intent, was to do
12 a survey, take photos, show you guys, without actually coming
13 to the property to see, hey, here's what we're seeing.
14 Here's the look, this is what's going on with the
15 neighborhood. You know, we've gotten zero pushback from any
16 neighbors whatsoever. They're actually very happy that
17 someone is going to be landscaping and making it kind of look
18 better. Because it just, it's not in good condition at all.

19 So I think if you had that report, you'd kind
20 of see a little bit more detail of what we're trying to
21 accomplish here.

22 MR. BOEHNER: There is a report that I
23 e-mailed to -- back in August. The purpose of the report was
24 that he's trying to make the case that they were exempt from
25 the EPOD regulations.

1 BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

2
3 NICHOLAS LEONARDO: No, I didn't --

4 MR. BOEHNER: -- I reviewed it, was to say you
5 needed to go and submit an application for an EPOD permit
6 because he was not considered exempt because the trees were
7 not dead and dying.

8 NICHOLAS LEONARDO: Well, some of them are
9 dead and dying, but the reason for the report is I just
10 wanted to know what the next steps were. But part of this
11 review was that we had this arborist report done prior to the
12 Board meeting, which we did do, and just now no one's even
13 looked at it.

14 JOSH DALEY: The report included a list of all
15 the trees, the sizes, it made note of what I call primary
16 justification. Again, dead within the footprint or within
17 ten feet of construction activity and then some other factors
18 as well.

19 And the map, that goes into greater detail and
20 uses, it bases it on the construction plan, but it X's out
21 the trees that I thought were objectively worth removing and
22 discusses them and there's pictures to give examples.

23 MR. BOEHNER: The number of the trees, it did
24 not -- it gives the type of the tree and the size of the
25 tree, but it did not give a condition of the tree. It talks

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

about a little bit of that most of the trees are going to be removed due to post-construction stress and decline.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: That's --

MR. BOEHNER: I'll be glad to get this out to the members if you'd like to look at it.

MS. CIVILETTI: I would like to see that please.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Yeah, all right. John, you asked. Jason, do you have other questions?

MR. BABCOCK-STINER: Just a second with John [inaudible].

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Okay, all right. This one is a challenge. Ramsey, let's send that out, that report.

MR. BOEHNER: We have a neighbor that wants to speak.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Yeah, let's open this up to the public. Is there anyone in the audience that cares to address this application, kindly raise your hand.

MR. BOEHNER: I know Tom Hack wants to speak. He did contact us early. Want me to unmute him?

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Please do.

MR. BOEHNER: Tom, are you there?

TOM HACK: Can you guys see me and hear me?

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

MR. BOEHNER: I hear you. There you are.

TOM HACK: Okay, I see you guys and I hear you guys, hopefully you hear me too.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Go ahead.

TOM HACK: Okay. First, I want to say thanks to Nicholas for taking on this project. This is a complicated project for everyone, it's not an easy site. We all know that. So congratulations, Nicholas for being on board and taking that.

As far as the number of trees in the neighborhood, you know, I'm actually in my house right now counting trees in my neighborhood and looking out my window. And the average tree is probably about 15 trees per lot. Myself, I have 25 trees on my lot. And our lots are nowhere near as large.

There's actually three lots combined so, you know, looking at that, you shouldn't really be judging the neighborhood from lot to lot to lot throughout the neighborhood. It actually would be about only 54 trees is probably what you're looking at down on your end over there.

One of the things too I think you need to keep in mind as far as, you know, neighborhood, you're within 200 feet of a Federal wetlands which is directly across the

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

1
2
3 railroad from you. I know Mark Ford did a big, extensive
4 thing of preserving that, so you're talking about being
5 closer to the woodlands area. That's pretty important to
6 keep in mind.

7 While the neighborhood is a 1920s subdivision,
8 there's a lot of wood areas around us. There's 490, there's
9 Federal wetlands directly across from you, I took a walk
10 through there today.

11 I do take exception about the condition of the
12 property. That's actually in pretty good shape, really, I
13 mean, regardless of the trees, as far as like, there's very
14 little garbage out there, very little. I walked through
15 today with my dog. Granted, you've got a lot of weeds and
16 vegetation, branches, old trees, stuff like that, natural
17 destruction more or less. But as far as, like, garbage and
18 dog piles and, you know, just junk everywhere, there isn't a
19 whole lot of that.

20 One thing we are concerned with in the
21 neighborhood is really the fact that it is a woodlot EPOD.
22 And originally everyone is all excited because you had the
23 house coming in, a great look to the house, everything looked
24 good. So I thought we were in good shape with that, with the
25 Phase 1 there, if that's what you want to call it.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

Now, because you got a contractor on board, and it seems your contractor drives the thought, that the contractor is really having a hard time working around this site. So, and like all contractors, their general thought is to level the whole playing field, just take everything down, tear it all down. Start from scratch, makes it easier for them. Cheaper then, when nothing gets in their way so they can run their dozers and their backhoes all over the site.

Now, the question I got for you really boils down to a couple things. One is, it's a level of disturbance. When you look at the site plan I'm looking at right now, you know, you're taking down quite a few trees that are way beyond the 20 or 30 feet from the house. You know, if you actually put your scale on the drawing itself and look at it, you know, from each corner of the house to your level of disturbance, you're taking a substantial amount of trees that are 50/80 feet away. That, I don't quite understand why.

Now I do get, you know, Josh was talking about earlier about a lot of trees being diseased, distressed, you know, half dead, whatever. Yeah, granted, those need to go. One thing we haven't seen from a neighborhood perspective is a landscaping plan. So it's one thing, you know, like was

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

mentioned earlier, I don't know who said it, all I see on the plan and all our neighbors see on the plan is remove, remove, remove. The whole entire, clearcut this site.

I was out there three hours ago looking around, and every single thing's coming out. So we don't know what's going in, in fact from what we've seen nothing is going in. Now, there may be big plans for, you know, to reestablish some plantings and that would be great.

But as far, you know, from our point of view, you got a woodland EPOD overlay district in place, and it was a pre-approved, everything was approved, why not just stay with that. We haven't seen any reason really to go beyond, except that the contractor just wants to make it easier for them.

NICHOLAS LEONARDO: Well, well, I can just jump in there. So actually, all --

MR. BOEHNER: Hold on.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: No, no, you don't jump in. Tom speaks and we'll ask you questions.

NICHOLAS LEONARDO: Okay.

TOM HACK: Thank you. And two other things we're thinking about is the soil, the stockpile soil. Not quite sure what the long term aspect that that is. Like I

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

1
2
3 say, I haven't -- we don't have all the plans. I don't have
4 all the whatever, 30/40/50 pages whatever it is on these
5 plans. So we're not quite sure, you know, is the stockpile
6 staying there? The Town of Brighton has a drainage ditch
7 right there, so I'm not sure, you know, as long term, is that
8 stockpile going to leach into the drainage ditch, or what is
9 the long term plan for that?

10 And the other thing too, the last piece of our
11 concern is the concrete truck washout station. We're not
12 sure why that's even showing on the plan, showing on the town
13 right of way. I would think that that would be the last
14 thing the Town would want in the right of way is a concrete
15 washout pit, you know, destroying your right of way, or, you
16 know, kind of messing up your right of way a little bit.

17 But I think one of the biggest things is, I
18 think it's just the number of trees, I think there's some
19 probably intermediate pieces. If you're planning new ones,
20 that would great. We haven't seen a lot of that, haven't
21 seen any of that. All we see is removal of 91 trees when,
22 you know, that's way beyond the level of disturbance. It
23 really doesn't reflect, you know, a lot of what's going on in
24 the neighborhood. We have been a big fan of protecting our
25 neighborhood, preserving the trees, the lots, everything we

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

can. We're working real hard at it. So that would be what our general thought is here. So with that, I've said my piece.

But, welcome to the neighborhood, Nick, looking forward to this going in, hopefully you can get some more trees put in around the house. That's all I have. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Thank you, Tom.

Is there anyone else who cares to address this application?

MR. BOEHNER: Please raise your hand.

Tom, do you know if anyone else wants to speak by any chance?

TOM HACK: No. I think one person was, but they couldn't arrange the call tonight. One thing, just for the town's point of view too, a lot of people don't see these flyers. You had put it out there, but it was taken down about two weeks ago. I took a picture and sent it to you guys, it was just laying in the woods.

So a lot of my neighbors weren't quite sure what was going on with the whole process. So they kind of are very interested in it, but didn't get word of this. So, but not that I know of, Ramsey, I don't think anyone called

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

in.

MR. BOEHNER: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: I'd like to give Nick about a minute to respond to Mr. Hack's comments.

NICHOLAS LEONARDO: Yes. So the overall excavation is actually because of there's larger tree removals, actually it's much, much, costing us way more money. This is something that we actually, it is a cost we are taking on in addition because, again, you know, he is right, there is some garbage, in my opinion, but a lot of it is just destruction from the wind and branches and things of that nature. There's a lot of fallen trees on the property. You'll see pictures of that in the arborist report.

But also, in the plan, in the comments there are some in the early plans it does show that we are planting more trees. Now, obviously, we already expected that if we are going to remove this many trees we would be planting trees to replace them.

And from a neighborhood standpoint, I do understand, but your house does have, you know, you said 20 trees, I have a lot of friends in the neighborhood and some of them have maybe two, some of them maybe do have 20. They're all different houses. I don't want to speculate who

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

has how many trees. I do think though that once the house is actually there, if we are planting additional trees in the perimeter of the property all around the property lines, that's really going to kind of fill in where the trees were.

So as far as the look, I mean, it's still going to have a lot of trees. You're talking still about 30 plus trees on the property or more, plus the additional trees that we plan to plant.

So I believe that as far as the neighbors, if you walk down the right of way or you're walking by the house, really, it's going to look very similar with some new trees over time, they're going to have to grow.

But a lot of the major trees, big, big, major trees around the perimeter of the house are staying, which, you know, a lot of these trees marked for removal are six, five, eight-inch trees that, I mean, they're basically, they don't even have branches most of them. They just kind of look like sticks sticking out.

So a lot of those are the ones that are on the plan for removal. So hopefully that will alleviate some of the concern. Or at least your concern, maybe a couple of the neighbors that, it is our intention to plant some more trees and keep it in line with the rest of the neighborhood, and

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

preserve as much as we can. But also, maintain a yard and a safe environment for our house.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Okay, thank you, Nick. I appreciate your thoughts, but the entire purpose of a woodlot EPOD has nothing to do with neighborhood aesthetics. So I personally am going to discount any of your comments regarding trying to make this more aesthetically compatible with the rest of the neighborhood. That is simply not the function or the reason for an EPOD.

Secondly, the reason for leaving trees, even if they're dead and lying on the ground, may offer environmental benefit. So I understand your desire to have a manicured yard, but again, that is not the reason we have environmental protection overly districts or woodlots, steep slopes, and wetlands.

They have entirely different functions than to serve just your purpose of having a lot to build a single-family home on. So you're aesthetic arguments and compatibility of the neighborhood is discounted completely on my part. But as far as a compromise on this, I would think that there is some rationale for dead or diseased trees to be removed at the time of when it's easier for the machinery to get in there and do it.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

I don't buy any argument for the convenience of your contractor. I don't buy any argument for the protection of removing a tree because it will potentially be damaged and die in five years. That's why we have tree protection plans. That's why we will make sure you follow it. And if your contractor needs to use a different piece of equipment to move around, then he's going to have to use a different piece of equipment.

And if you need to relocate your stockpile topsoil pile once or twice and reestablish your erosion control measures, you're going to have to do that.

Like I say, I think I would like to see this tree report. And I do agree that there are probably some of these trees that can come down if they are, in fact, as you and Josh, say diseased and dead. If they are not diseased and dead, or they are in substantially good condition, I don't see a need to remove an additional 41 trees or 42 trees because it's, you know, an aesthetic reason.

I would be willing to participate in a site visit to actually review the plan, look at these trees and make a determination on what might go and what might not. Now, Ramsey and David Dollinger will tell me if that's an appropriate approach or not.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

To Mr. Hack, the concrete washout area will not remain. That is a standard requirement of the erosion control plan, erosion and sediment control plan. And certainly a condition of a SWIP.

I don't know what anybody else has to say, but that's my points. I don't know what anyone else thinks.

Laura?

MS. CIVILETTI: I don't have any additional comments.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: David?

MR. FADER: I pretty much agree with everything you said.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: John?

MR. OSOWSKI: I agree that we need more information and some more information and I'd like to see that tree report to have a better idea.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Thank you. Pam?

MS. DELANEY: I agree with what everyone has said that we need more information on this.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Jason?

MR. BABCOCK-STINER: Yeah, I agree with what you said, Bill.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: All right. Ramsey, David

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

Dollinger any final comments?

MR. BOEHNER: No. There's definitely, we can talk about it during the discussion, specifically what information that we'll want from them. There's the SWIP, there's the grading, there's a landscape mitigation plan. And then you guys didn't discuss if you want any modifications for this plan or anything else that you may want to have revised. We can do that during the discussions. I guess, Bill, the only other thing I would say is we just want to check one more time to see if there's anyone else who would like to speak.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: That said, is there anyone else that cares to address this application?

MR. BOEHNER: Raise your hand.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Okay. We're going to move on to the next application.

APPLICATION 9P-02-20

9P-02-20 Application of Teamsters Local #118, owner, and DiPasquale Construction, Inc., agent, for Final Site Plan Approval to construct a 2,617 +/- sf building addition and expand the parking lot on property located at 130 Metro Park. All as described on application and plans on file.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

APPLICATION 7P-NB1-20

7P-NB1-20 Application of Teamsters Local #118, owner, and DiPasquale Construction, Inc., agent, for Preliminary Site Plan Approval to construct a 2,617 +/- sf building addition and expand the parking lot on property located at 130 Metro Park. All as described on application and plans on file.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Very good, Joe, welcome.

JOE JACOBS: Good evening.

MR. BOEHNER: Joe, do you have anyone else that would like to join you?

JOE JACOBS: We do not.

MR. BOEHNER: Okay.

JOE JACOBS: Joe Jacobs, I'm representing EDR in Rochester, at 274 North Goodman Street, Rochester, New York, 14607. We are representing DiPasquale Construction on this project. And the owner is obviously, Teamsters Local 118. About two or three months ago we came to the Board for preliminary site plan approval which we -- the application was tabled. And the reason was simple, we had two easements, we had two variances that we needed to seek to get.

And we had consequently, last two weeks ago we received the two variances. They were for site -- or for

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

coverage, for impervious coverage. The lot previously -- or the lot, when this Planning Board had originally reviewed, it was approximately 73 percent impervious area, about 73 percent coverage.

And for the Zoning Board we attempted to reduce the coverage and increase the green space as much as possible. We were able to get it down 69 percent, the allowable in the district is 65 percent.

The second variance was for parking and driveway setback to connect to the existing asphalt area we have, is obviously an existing nonconformance. However, you may notice on, it's actually the west side of the site, but it's planned up toward the top of the plan.

We carved out a chunk of space, impervious area for green space and for subsequently for snow storage too as well. So we kind of three birds with one stone, increased our green space and snow storage, and also reduce our -- were able to reduce as much as our impervious coverage as possible.

Since then, the last time you've seen this submission as well, we have some, one of the big questions was, what we were going to do, what we were going to need to do for water in terms of, there's a building code, Section 73

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

1
2
3 that requires projects of a certain cost in relation to the
4 actual worth of the building and there needs to be upgrades
5 in terms of building sprinklers. The applicant, the cost for
6 the applicant did exceed that threshold, so consequently fire
7 service is going to be provided or installed in addition to
8 the domestic water service to essentially sprinkle the
9 building.

10 We have also added a Dumpster enclosure per
11 Conservation Board and per I believe the Planning Board's
12 comment as well. We are looking for some sort of Dumpster
13 enclosure that would house an existing Dumpster on site, so
14 we put that next to the shed. You can see that in the plan
15 on the bottom right, but it's actually the northeast corner
16 of the proposed parking expansion. That's tucked in next to
17 the shed and also behind the existing wooded area that is on
18 the adjacent property, so you will have screening there.

19 In terms of plantings, we kept the same three
20 river birches in the back along with the, I believe it is the
21 tupelo. We have added at the request of the Conservation
22 Board an additional tree out front. In the front as you
23 approach the building from the east side along Metro Park,
24 there's a flagpole and signage on the building and that's on
25 the east side of the building. We didn't want to disturbed

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

1
2
3 that side of the building. So the only place really that we
4 were able to find that made sense in terms of symmetry and
5 for visibility, was to provide another Linden tree to match
6 the six-inch Linden that is just to the west of a main
7 12-inch large Linden. Yes, that's the main one. So now it
8 will be symmetrical and, you know, what's the rule of thumb,
9 Bill, it's never an even number. So we have three Lindens in
10 a row.

11 And consequently, we actually have another
12 proposed, because of the installation water service and fire
13 service we needed to remove two existing shrubs. In lieu of
14 those two shrubs we are showing in a link here, just to
15 provide some more color than just a shrub, evergreen shrub.
16 And it also provides some buffering, some additional
17 buffering to the existing parking that's there.

18 And that is a majority of it. We're working
19 to, we have addressed a majority of the Town of Brighton Town
20 Engineer's comments, been working with Evert. We have some
21 more updates for him with regard to additional approvals. We
22 need to seek specific paper for the Monroe County Pure Waters
23 master plan review and also for Water Authority because of
24 that fire service.

25 But we have reached out, we have, you know, a

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

fire protection consultant on staff, or that has been signed up for doing the hydraulics. So it's really more to make sure we get the applications in to those agencies and authorities. I think that's about it.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Okay, thank you. I listened in to the variance application, I don't have any further questions. Does the Board have any questions?

MS. CIVILETTI: I'm all set thank you.

MR. BABCOCK-STINER: I'm good.

MS. DELANEY: I'm set.

MR. OSOWSKI: This is John, I'm good.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: David?

MR. DOLLINGER: I'm okay, I'm fine.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: All right. Ramsey, do you have any questions? I can't believe we lost Ramsey. Did we lose Ramsey?

MR. BOEHNER: No, I'm sorry. Joe, can you just explain the exterior lighting that's being proposed, real quick? Joe is muted.

JOE JACOBS: Yes. The Photometrics exterior lighting, there are two wall packs. They are, per our last meeting, I believe it was Bill, 3,000k so we could keep it at that level. And consequently the Photometrics are

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

five-tenths of a foot candle, one-tenth of a foot candle about ten feet away. So very low level light and they will be above the two doors to the proposed addition.

MR. BOEHNER: That's all I have, Bill. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: All right. We will open it up to the audience. Is there anybody in the public that wishes to address this application, please raise your hand. Ramsey or Jeff, seeing anybody?

JEFF FISCHER: I don't see anybody.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Ask one more time, anybody wish to address this application, for Teamsters Local 118 at Metro Park? All right, Joe, thank you.

JOE JACOBS: Thank you all. Hope you have a wonderful rest of your evening.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Thank you.

I believe that is it for our Public Hearings.

MR. BOEHNER: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Ramsey, do you want to go back and resolve these or move on?

MR. BOEHNER: Put the signs last, but, Bill, I'm going to the applications having been adjourned, in case there are people on and waiting for those, if I could do

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

that. Applications 8P-01-20, the application of 2171 West Henrietta Road has been adjourned to the October 21st meeting.

Application 8P-02-20, application of Passero Associates for 2816 Monroe Avenue has been adjourned until the October 21st meeting.

Application 8P-03-20, application of Passero Associates for 2125 Monroe Avenue has been adjourned to the October 21st meeting.

And last, application 9P-NB1-20, application of Baptist Bible Temple, located at 1075 Clover Street has been adjourned to the October 21st meeting.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Okay, thank you.

Let's go back to our reviewing of the applications.

* * *

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

APPLICATION 9P-01-20

9P-01-20 Application of Nicholas Leonardo, owner, for Site Plan Modification and woodlot EPOD permit modification (9P-01-19 & 1P-01-20) to remove additional trees for the purpose of constructing a new house on property located west of the intersection of Clover Street and Greenaway Road, known as Tax ID #s 122.16-1-5, 122.16-1-4 and 122.16-1-3. All as described on application and plans on file.

MR. FADER: I move the Board tables Application 9P-01-20 based on the testimony given and plans submitted. The 13 items and additional information outlined in the Planning Board report are requested to make the determination of significance and to have a complete application.

MR. BOEHNER: The hearing is kept open, motion by Mr. Fader.

CONDITIONS:

1. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) by the applicant in accordance with the specifications outlined by the Town, reviewed by the appropriate board and approved By the Town Engineer.
2. A revised grading plan will be submitted to the Town that

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

takes into consideration the increases disturbance caused by additional removal of trees.

3. Provide a survey of all the trees to be removed on the site over 5 inches in diameter identified by species, condition, and worthiness for preservation. The survey shall be prepared by a qualified consulting forester, arborist, or horticulturist.

4. The applicant shall submit a robust landscaping plan to mitigate the considerable loss in vegetation now being proposed.

5. The project and its construction entrance shall meet the New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control.

6. The contractor shall designate a member of his or her firm to be responsible to monitor erosion control, erosion control structures, tree protection and preservation throughout construction.

7. All trees to be saved shall be protected with orange construction fencing placed at the drip line or a distance greater than the drip line. Trees shall be pruned, watered, and fertilized prior to, during and after construction. Materials and equipment storage shall not be allowed in fenced areas.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

8. Maintenance of landscape plantings shall be guaranteed for three (3) years.

9. Any contractor or individual involved in the planting, maintenance or removal of trees shall comply with the requirements of the town's Excavation and Clearing (Chapter 66), Trees (Chapter 175) and other pertinent regulations and shall be registered and shall carry insurance as required by Chapter 175 of the Comprehensive Development Regulations.

10. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, a letter of credit shall be provided to the Town to cover the cost of materials and installation for all landscaping to ensure that all landscaping conforms to the approved plans and that the landscape survives in a healthy condition.

11. Erosion control measures shall be in place prior to site disturbance.

12. A letter or memo in response to all Planning Board and Town Engineer comments and conditions shall be submitted.

13. The applicant shall submit an alternative tree removal plan showing only dead or dying trees to be removed in addition to the trees that were previously approved by the Planning Board.

MS. CIVILETTI: Second.

MR. BOEHNER: Civiletti seconds.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Price?

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Fader?

MR. FADER: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: Ms. Civiletti?

MS. CIVILETTI: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: Ms. Delaney?

MS. DELANEY: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Osowski?

MR. OSOWSKI: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: Application is tabled.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

APPLICATION 9P-02-20

9P-02-20 Application of Teamsters Local #118, owner, and DiPasquale Construction, Inc., agent, for Final Site Plan Approval to construct a 2,617 +/- sf building addition and expand the parking lot on property located at 130 Metro Park. All as described on application and plans on file.

APPLICATION 7P-NB1-20

7P-NB1-20 Application of Teamsters Local #118, owner, and DiPasquale Construction, Inc., agent, for Preliminary Site Plan Approval to construct a 2,617 +/- sf building addition and expand the parking lot on property located at 130 Metro Park. All as described on application and plans on file.

MR. FADER: I move we close the Public Hearing.

CHAIRPERSON LUDWIG: I will second. All in favor?

ALL COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. FADER: I move the Board approves 7P-NB1-20 and 9P-02-20 and based on the testimony given and the plans submitted and the 25 conditions, and the Board adopts the negative declaration prepared by the Town staff.

CONDITIONS:

1. An Operational Permit shall be obtained from the Town of Brighton Fire Marshal (Chris Roth, 585-784-5220).
2. The entire building shall comply with the most current Building & Fire Codes of New York State.
3. Prior to issuance of any building permits, all plans for utility and storm water control systems must be reviewed and have been given approval by appropriate authorities. Prior to any occupancy, work proposed on the approved plans shall have been completed to a degree satisfactory to the appropriate authorities.
4. All necessary variances shall be obtained from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
5. The architectural design and building materials of the proposed building(s) shall be reviewed and approved by the Town of Brighton Architectural Review Board.
6. Meet all requirements of the Town of Brighton's Department of Public Works.
7. All Town codes shall be met that relate directly or indirectly to the applicant's request.
8. The project and its construction entrance shall meet the New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

9. The contractor shall designate a member of his or her firm to be responsible to monitor erosion control, erosion control structures, tree protection and preservation throughout construction.

10. All trees to be saved shall be protected with orange construction fencing placed at the drip line or a distance greater than the drip line. Trees shall be pruned, watered, and fertilized prior to, during and after construction. Materials and equipment storage shall not be allowed in fenced areas.

11. Maintenance of landscape plantings shall be guaranteed for three (3) years.

12. Any contractor or individual involved in the planting, maintenance or removal of trees shall comply with the requirements of the town's Excavation and Clearing (Chapter 66), Trees (Chapter 175) and other pertinent regulations and shall be registered and shall carry insurance as required by Chapter 175 of the Comprehensive Development Regulations.

13. Outside storage and display shall be prohibited.

14. Maintenance and repair of equipment shall be prohibited.

15. Prior to the issuance of any building permits a landscape and parking plan shall be submitted, reviewed and approved by the Building and Planning Department.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

16. All outstanding Site Plan comments and concerns of the Town Engineer and Fire Marshal shall be addressed.

17. All outstanding Site Plan comments and concerns of the Town Engineer regarding soil erosion, storm water control, water system and sanitary sewer design shall be addressed.

18. All County Development Review Comments shall be addressed.

19. All other reviewing agencies must issue their approval prior to the Department of Public Works issuing its final approval.

20. A letter of credit shall be provided to cover certain aspects of the project, including, but not limited to landscaping, stormwater mitigation, infrastructure and erosion control. The applicant's engineer shall prepare an itemized estimate of the scope of the project as a basis for the letter of credit.

21. Erosion control measures shall be in place prior to site disturbance.

22. The location of any proposed generators shall be shown on the site plan. All requirements of the Comprehensive Development Regulations shall be met or a variance shall be obtained from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

23. All comments and concerns of the Town Engineer as

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

contained in the attached memo dated September 15, 2020, from Evert Garcia to Ramsey Boehner, shall be addressed.

24. A letter or memo in response to all Planning Board and Town Engineer comments and conditions shall be submitted.

25. All new accessible parking space signage to be installed or replaced shall have the logo depicting a dynamic character leaning forward with a sense of movement as required by Secretary of State pursuant to section one hundred one of the Executive Law.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: I will second. Any discussion? Call the roll, please, Ramsey.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Osowski?

MR. OSOWSKI: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Babcock-Stiner?

MR. BABCOCK-STINER: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: Ms. Delaney?

MS. DELANEY: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: Ms. Civiletti?

MS. CIVILETTI: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Fader?

MR. FADER: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Price?

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Aye.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

MR. BOEHNER: Motion passes.

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

SIGNS:

1588 Lazzara Smiles Orthodontics, for a building face sign at
925 East Henrietta Road.

1589 USA Vein Clinics, for a building face sign at 1882
Winton Road #2.

MR. BOEHNER: 1588, the application be tabled
so they can get required sign variance from the Zoning Board
of Appeals.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: So moved.

MR. FADER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: All in favor?

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Price?

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: Yes.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Fader?

MR. FADER: Yes.

MR. BOEHNER: Ms. Civiletti?

MS. CIVILETTI: Yes.

MR. BOEHNER: Ms. Delaney?

MS. DELANEY: Yes.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Osowski?

MR. OSOWSKI: Yes.

MR. BOEHNER: Motion passes.

1589 for 1882 Winton road I recommend we

BRIGHTON PLANNING BOARD 09/16/2020

approve as recommended.

CHAIRPERSON PRICE: I will move on approval as recommended by the Architectural Review Board.

MR. FADER: I will second that.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Osowski?

MR. OSOWSKI: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Babcock-Stiner?

MR. BABCOCK-STINER: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: Ms. Delaney?

MS. DELANEY: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: Ms. Civiletti?

MS. CIVILETTI: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: Mr. Fader?

MR. FADER: Aye.

MR. BOEHNER: That's it.

* * *

REPORTER CERTIFICATE

I, Rhoda Collins, do hereby certify that I did report in stenotype machine shorthand the proceedings held in the above-entitled matter;

Further, that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate transcription of my said stenographic notes taken at the time and place hereinbefore set forth.

Dated this 10th day of October, 2020.

At Rochester, New York

Rhoda Collins
Rhoda Collins