

VILLAGE OF MINOA
Planning Board Meeting Minutes
November 8, 2018

359 S Main St. Site Plan Application

Present: Chairman Dan DeLucia, Planning Board Members: Alan Archer, Gail Greiner, Sheri Hayner, John Jarmacz, and Attorney Courtney Hills and Secretary Barbara Sturick.

Absent:

Also Present: Greg Hoover, John and Sharon Valerio and Jim Krusse.

Upon due notice, a scheduled public hearing, followed by a regular meeting of the Village of Minoa Planning Board, was held on November 8, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. at the Municipal Building, 240 North Main Street, Minoa, New York, for the review of the site plan application of 359 S Main St.

Chairman Dan DeLucia opened the public hearing at 6:30 p.m., stating the purpose of the hearing was regarding the application of John and Sharon Valerie, for Site Plan Review pursuant to Sections 127-3, 4 & 7 of the Village of Minoa Code, for the premises situate at 359 S Main Street and identified as Tax Parcel No. 004.-06-03.2. Applicant is proposing to modify the prior approved use to a new use, specifically a retail use.

Greg Hoover, Building Consultant and Design for John and Sharon Valerio presented the following:

- Reiterated information provided in letter submitted October 3, 2018 here attached Schedule "1"
- Applicant proposes to restore the building to its original stature as when built in 1910 electric railroad
- The overgrown of plantation has been impacting the foundation of the building and proposes to restore with crusher run
- Applicant proposes to install new windows as finances permit, starting with the first floor windows and also the replacement and repair to exterior building bricks
- Applicant proposes to update the current sign on the existing pole next to road

Attorney Hills reviewed the Village Code with respect to the proposed signage and advised the Applicant must appear before Village Board per village code Section 127-12 for a Special Permit for same.

Public Comments as follows:

Resident Jim Krusse of 346 S Main St:

- He stated he is glad to see what was going on and came to the meeting to meet the new owners
- He stated his concern is the upkeep of the property as the previous owner did not maintain the property

Planning Board discussed replies, questions and concerns:

- Whether or not there was ample parking
- Location of current sign pole and updating to new name, clarifying whether or not the current sign is a monument sign and clarification of existing pole
- Construction dumpster and village code on property maintenance

A motion was made by John Jarmacz and seconded by Alan Archer to close the public hearing at 6:57 pm and continue with regular meeting. All in favor. Motion carried.

Attorney Hills suggested the Planning Board review each of the review standards per Article IV § 127-12 General standards and considerations for Site Plan Review. The Planning Board members discussed among themselves the following:

- A. The location, arrangement, size, design and general site compatibility of the building, lighting and signage. It was the consensus of the Board that the current upgrades would be a considerable improvement to the appearance of the property. In addition, the interior of the structure would undergo many upgrades, bringing same up to NYS Code.
- B. The adequacy and arrangement of vehicular traffic access and circulation, including intersections, road widths, pavement surfaces, dividers and traffic controls. It was the consensus of the Board that same was more than adequate for that location and proposed use.
- C. The location, arrangement, appearance and sufficiency of off-street parking and loading. It was the consensus of the Board that the application complies with Village Code with respect to parking spaces.
- D. The adequacy and arrangement of pedestrian traffic access and circulation, walkway structures, control of intersections with vehicular traffic and overall pedestrian convenience. No change.
- E. The adequacy of stormwater and drainage facilities. It was the consensus of the Board that the stormwater and drainage facilities were adequate and that the new use would not have a significantly larger impact than the prior use.
- F. The adequacy of water supply and sewage disposal facilities. NA

- G. The adequacy, type and arrangement of trees, shrubs and other landscaping constituting a visual and/or noise buffer between the applicant's and adjoining lands, including the maximum retention of existing vegetation. It was the consensus of the Board that the change in appearance would be a significant improvement from the existing appearance and that no additional buffering would be needed.
- H. The adequacy of fire lanes and other emergency zones and the provision of fire hydrants. It was the consensus of the Board that there was adequate access to fire lanes and hydrants.
- I. Special attention to the adequacy and impact of structures, roadways and landscaping in areas with susceptibility to ponding, flooding and/or erosion. It was the consensus of the Board that there would be no susceptibility to ponding, flooding or erosion as there would be no changes to the structure, roadways or landscaping.
- J. Overall impact on the neighborhood, including compatibility of design considerations, environmental and aesthetic impacts. It was the consensus of the Board that the overall impact on the neighborhood would be positive. The update and maintenance would be more aesthetically pleasing than the current condition of the property.

Attorney Hills stated under New York State Environmental Quality Review Act, the application is comprised of a Type II Action, the applicant filled out Part 1 of the NYS Environmental Quality Review short form detailing the proposed action. The Board elected to serve as Lead Agency, reviewed Part I of the Short Form SEQRA, and determined based on the information provided the proposed action would result in no moderate to large impacts, and issued a Determination of Significance that the proposed action would have no adverse environmental impacts.

A Motion made by Dan DeLucia and seconded by Sheri Hayner to approve the Site Plan without the Sign. All in favor. Motion carried.

A Motion made by John Jarmacz and seconded by Alan Archer close the Planning Board Meeting at 7:00 pm. All in favor. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Sturick
Deputy Clerk Treasurer