

CITY OF AUBURN PLANNING BOARD
TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 2016 6:30 PM, MEMORIAL CITY HALL

Present: Sam Giangreco, Anne McCarthy, Andy Tehan, Crystal Cosentino, Theresa Walsh, Tim Baroody

Staff: Stephen Selvek, Senior Planner; Greg Gilfus, Traffic Officer APD; Stacy DeForrest, Corporation Counsel

Agenda Items: Site Plan Review for 14 Allen Street; Site Plan Review for 68 North Division Street; Site Plan Review for 217 Genesee Street.

Items Approved: SEQRA and Site Plan Review for 14 Allen Street; SEQRA and Site Plan Review for 68 North Division Street; SEQRA and Site Plan Review for 217 Genesee Street.

Applications Denied: None.

Applications Tabled: None.

Chair calls the meeting to order. The Pledge of Allegiance is recited. Roll is called.

Agenda Item 1: Approval of February 2, 2016 Meeting Minutes.

Chair asks for a motion to approve the minutes of the February 2, 2016 meeting. So moved by Theresa Walsh, seconded by Andy Tehan. All members vote approval. No members opposed. Motion carried.

Agenda Item 2: 14 Allen Street: Site Plan Review for the installation of a telecommunication tower and facility. Applicant: Crown Castle.

Chair asks staff for updates.

Stephen Selvek- As noted in your packets, the intent of tonight's meeting is to first review the SEQRA Environmental Review and consideration of the Site Plan application. You will note that on your table this evening there was a letter provided by the Camardo Law Firm on behalf of the neighbors in that area opposing the cell tower. Ultimately the letter demands a proper review of SEQRA. Tonight's purpose is to review SEQRA. Items identified within the letter relate to noise, environmental contamination and segmentation. All of the concerns in the letter will be discussed tonight under SEQRA review.

Reviews the SEQRA Long Form, which includes answers drafted by staff and was provided in board packets. Board questions and comments may be expressed at any point during the review and can be discussed in greater detail tonight.

In Part II of the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) there are several sections that indicate no impact and these are based on the information in part I of the EAF, which is the responsibility of the applicant. As we proceed through the questions it is a yes or no answer and in some cases some additional information is required. In areas there are no answers, there is no impact and include the following areas: geological features, surface waters, flooding, agriculture resources, historic and archeological resources, open space and recreation, critical environmental areas, transportation, and consistency with community plans. Areas that have been marked as having

some impact include: land, groundwater, air, plants and animals, energy, noise, odor, and human health. The final area is if there is an impact which exceeds one of the thresholds in part II. Additional consideration under part III is given and that includes aesthetic resources and consistency with community character.

Reviews EAF Part II.

Section 1: Impact on Land - Proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of, the land surface or the proposed site. Marked as yes. Reviews the threshold items and states that if any of them are to be met that they are to be marked as moderate to large impact. In this case, threshold questions a-g, are all marked no and are small or no impact since the thresholds are not met.

Section 2: Geological Features. No impact.

Section 3: Surface Waters. No impact.

Section 4: Groundwater. The question reads that the proposed action may result in new or additional use of groundwater, or may have the potential to introduce containments to groundwater or an aquifer. In review of part I questions D2.a, D2.c, D2.d, One of the items was yes and therefore proceeds to review threshold questions a-g. None of the thresholds are met or exceeded meaning there is no or small impact as a result.

SEQRA form is on large media screen in Council Chambers for public to view.

Section 5: Impact on Flooding. When reviewing the items there are no impacts on flooding for proposed project.

Section 6: Impact on Air. The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source. In reviewing D2f, D2h, and D2g there is a note that one of the items is yes and in respect to running a backup generator on the property and construction vehicles. None of the thresholds are met in questions a-e meaning no or small impact.

Section 7: Plants and Animals. The proposed impact may result in the loss of flora or fauna. There is existing brush on the site and those areas will be impacted. In review of the thresholds in a-i, they are all noted as small to moderate impacts and this one in particular had to do with the use of herbicide on the stone gravel area to maintain that particular area. The application sites this is an operational procedure and will be used according to the directions of that herbicide.

Section 8: Impacts on Archeological Resources. E3a. and b. indicate that there is no impact.

Section 9: Impact on Aesthetic Resources. E1a. b. and h. indicate that there is the potential of an impact on aesthetic resources. The review of the application notes that the proposed action will be visible from a publicly accessible vantage point both seasonally and year round. This was selected to be a potential moderate or large impact. Section a. The proposed action may be visible from any officially designated federal, state or local scenic or aesthetic resource. The potential is a moderate to large impact. In areas where it has been selected to have a moderate or large impact more discussion is warranted under part III.

Section 10: Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources. Review of part I indicates no. A no answer was provided there.

Section 11: Impact on Open Space and Recreation. Review of part I indicates no and the answer is no there.

Section 12: Impact on Critical Environmental Areas. The review of part I indicates no and therefore the answer is no. There are no Critical Environmental Areas designated within the City.

Section 13: Impact on Transportation. Review of part I D2 j indicates that there is no result on potential impact and is therefore no.

Section 14: Impact on Energy. The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy. The review of part I indicates that this particular project does utilize electric provided by the local utility provider. Further review of the thresholds questions a-d none of the thresholds are met exceeded and therefore no impact or a small impact may occur.

Section 15: Impact on Noise, Odor and Light. The proposed action may increase noise, odor or lighting and a review of the section indicates that there is the potential for an impact. The thresholds outlined in this section, letters a-d, are not met or exceeded and is limited to no or small impact. In the letter provided by the Camardo Law Firm there are concerns around noise, specific to the generator on site. The information provided by the applicant on the proposed generator is for the industrial use threshold, which applies to light and heavy industrial uses. This is defined as a heavy commercial use, that particular threshold does not apply but for a test for reasonableness for this industrial district, although not an industrial use, we asked the applicant meet that particular threshold. The information provided was around a similar project and similar equipment in the Adirondack Park and the noise levels associated with those.

Chair asks applicant to confirm that the information contained in the report is applicable to this site.

Tim Baroody asks if this is an emergency generator only.

Stephen Selvek responds yes.

Andy Tehan- The threshold is the 15 feet of threshold that Mr. Camardo is referring to.

Stephen Selvek- The threshold is on page 3 in the letter where they speak to section 305-53 a.11. There are thresholds on allowable noise levels from an industrial source at the property line. I will also speak to Chapter 210 on the fifteen (15) feet as well for clarification purposes.

Andrew Leja, Barclay and Damon- With respect to the report that you have that was supplied by the applicant from Costich engineering, was a generator setup for a cell tower that is of the same type and brand of equipment that is intended to be used for this site. We wanted to ensure that the noise levels that were on that site would apply to this site as well. As for sound measurement of this level, the regulations in City Code require A weighted DBA level measurement and in the report each of the decibel levels are signified by DBA meaning weighted by A level, meeting the City's requirements for those types of sources.

Stephen Selvek- Chapter 210 of the City's Code states that it is unlawful for any constant unusual noise. That section that refers to a 15 foot rule which is targeted at nuisance noises created from a CD player or phonograph and is measured 15 feet from the house and is not applicable to the application before use today.

Continues Review of SEQRA part II.

Section 16: Impact on Human Health. The proposed action may have an impact on health from exposure to new or existing sources of contamination. This is marked yes. In part I it is noted that the proposed site is within a 2,000 ft. buffer to an existing brownfield site that is listed on the NYS DEC remediation database. The existing brownfield site is more commonly known as the Wadsworth site. In reviewing part 16 j: The proposed action may result in the excavation or other disturbance within 2,000 feet of a site used for the disposal of solid or hazardous waste. I noted that this would be no because the site is not intended for the disposal of hazardous waste. It is a brownfield that exists and the potential of containments existing on that brownfield to exist on this property are remote for two reasons. The separation from that site to this site is approximately 1,900 feet at the closest distance and furthermore that site is down gradient of the proposed site. The Wadsworth site is at an elevation of 568 feet and the proposed site is approximately 610 feet. I noted that all of those impacts are no. These are environmental concerns that Camardo raised as well.

Anne McCarthy asks where the site is located.

Stephen Selvek-It is south west of this site and is located at the end of Canoga and Wadsworth Streets.

Section 17: Consistency with Community Plans. In reviewing part I C1, C2, and C3 the answers indicate that there is no impact on community plans. Essentially this is at looking at adopted land use plans and consistency with community plans. The proposed site for a cell tower is in an industrial zoned parcel, I1 industrial park, which permits this use.

Section 18: Consistency with Community Character. I noted that there is potential for impact. In reviewing question e. The proposed action is inconsistent with the predominant architectural scale and character. I noted that there is the potential for a moderate to large impact and will be reviewing this in more detail in part III of the SEQRA form.

Part III SEQRA Form:

Based on information in part 1 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form, the following sections, in part 2, have been marked "yes" and exceeds at least one thresholds listed in each of the sections: Impact of Aesthetic Recourses and Consistency with Community Character.

Impact of Aesthetic Recourses.

While the project sponsor has indicated that the action is within 5 miles of any officially designated scenic or aesthetic resource, the resources identified by the sponsor do not appear to have the same significance as those noted in the EAF guidance provided by NYSDEC in the Full EAF Workbook that states:

"Officially designated scenic areas include scenic byways, scenic roads, scenic areas of statewide significance, scenic trails, and scenic rivers. Other designated areas may also include places or sites listed on the National or State Registers of Historic Places, State Parks, State Forest Preserve areas, State Game Refuges, National Natural Landmarks, and National Park Service Lands."

None the less, the potential impact of the action on Casey Park is still worthy of consideration. Although the action is the construction of telecommunication facility, including both ground level improvements and a tower, the aesthetic concerns are associated specifically with the tower; therefore further discussion will focus on that element. A balloon test conducted December 4, 2015 and subsequent photo simulations indicate that the top of the 150' tower would be visible from the Falcon/Casey Park area. The antenna array mounted at 120' would however not be visible or would be visually obscured by the existing vegetation.

Within Falcon Park there are 100' tall poles to support the stadium lighting which are readily visible and closer to Casey Park. When considered in the context of the existing 100' lighting poles for the stadium,

which are effectively located between a Casey Park user and the proposed tower, the visual quality of the proposed tower will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on aesthetic resources.

Consistency with Community Character.

The site of the proposed action is vacant, industrial lands within Technology Park. The site is zone I-1: Industrial Park. The architectural character of this area is industrial consisting of metal sided one- and two-story used primarily for manufacturing, warehousing, and shipping and receiving with one building among these used for adult education. Adjacent to Technology Park, and the site of the proposed action, is a residential neighborhood consisting of primary of traditional one- and two-story homes. The telecommunication facility is not in sharp contrast to the community character as a whole. The setting of site, at the boarder of industrial/commercial uses and residential uses, must be considered when analyzing the impact on community character.

The site proposes a small one-story building to house equipment with an access drive from Allen St. and landscaping. The proposed landscaping, consisting of large shade trees and evergreens, and placement of the facility approximately 150' from the residential properties is intended to buffer the proposed project from the residential properties. The action will not generate traffic, noise, or other operating impacts that would be inconsistent with the general character of the area. The single element that may be inconsistent with the character of the area would be the height of the proposed 150' tower. Because of the 150' height of the proposed tower, the aesthetics of it would have the greatest impact specifically on, and limited to, the residential properties adjacent to the site. However, the tower height is not uncharacteristic of other towers within or around the City, which include along with their approximate height: York St. and N. Division St. – 200 Ft, Wiley St. – 150 Ft., Osborne St. – 244 Ft, and Cranbrook Rd. – 180 Ft. Additionally, the height of a tower, as an accessory structure, is exempt from zoning district requirements. For these reasons, the proposed tower will not have a significant adverse environmental impact on community character.

What the board is charged in doing is to assess these particular items in that particular context. This is a transitional zone between an industrial district and residential properties. That context is different than say completely in an industrial zone or completely in a residential zone. It's trying to balance those issues and looking beyond the specific impact to the residential neighbors and looking at if there is a broader impact to the community. The determination I reached is that based on the information the impact is limited in both scope and scale and would not have a significant adverse environmental impact.

If there are questions or comments I would be happy to discuss.

Theresa Walsh- In the memo to us there is a consideration of property values and was wondering if this was part of the environmental review.

Stephen Selvek- It is not a factor with environmental review but is a factor that was raised by the neighbors and is something to be considered when looking at the overall project. The environmental review does not look at social or economic impacts and if a project has a significant economic impact to an area but also an environmental impact, the environmental impact has to be mitigated before you can move forward with the economic impact. As for the environmental review we are looking at the items listed in part I, II, and III of the SEQRA form. The City assessor did look at the impact of property values with the Osborne street tower. He went back to 1997 and looked at repeat sales of properties to see what the average values of sales were. It is within the packets and there was an appreciation of 4.4% on property values in that neighborhood. For comparison he looked at the consumer price index that was 2.6% annually for that same time period. So in a neighborhood where a tower is present the houses were growing at rate beyond that of the consumer price index. The assessor's determination is that there is no external depreciation to property values within 500 feet or less of the tower.

Andy Tehan- I have a question on the impact on human life and the 2,000 foot radius. You mentioned the only site the search found was Wadsworth. Your search did not find any of the other sites that were found in the Camardo letter?

Stephen Selvek- It did not. The guidance for the SEQRA information directs you to the use of NYS Environmental Site Remediation database.

Anne McCarthy- What about segmentation and the build out plan.

Stephen Selvek- Last month we talked about concerns with segmentation under environmental review. Staff talked with the applicant wanting to know if there is a build out plan and if there is what that build out plan looks like so we would not end up with a situation where we end up with a tower here that forces us to place a tower elsewhere. They noted that Verizon does not have a build out a plan for every tower and area.

Chair invites the applicant to further explain.

Andy Leja- As I mentioned last month the placement of a tower is driven by two factors: capacity demands and coverage demands. Those demands are driven by customer needs. Verizon is not going to put a tower in a place where data capacity and coverage is adequate. Verizon looks to fill gaps and in this case there is a large gap in capacity and coverage especially under 4G LTE, that could be serviced by that tower. To the extent that Verizon could predict build outs would be to the extent of the city being able to predict population increases in certain areas of the city over the next number of years. It is also dependent on how many people would be using devices and how much capacity would be used by that population spurt. It is a reactive situation to gaps in coverage and capacity. It is a reactive response to where the population spikes and where the devices are that consume data and their demands.

Stephen Selvek- To that, segmentation is not a concern. We are reviewing the application in its entirety noting that we understand that there may be future towers that occur but we cannot guess on the impacts of those towers would be until we are aware of where they would occur.

Crystal Cosentino- If we decided a 150 ft. tower was too high and opted for 120/125ft. tower. If someone wanted to collocate, they would not be able to and would that result in a tower in a geography that could have been mitigated if it had been high enough to collocate?

Stephen Selvek- If a tower was designed in a way for upward expansion for collocation, than it is possible for collocation to happen. Collocation may be more costly for an applicant if the additional 30 feet does not exist they may opt to say that it is more feasible for them to find another site for a tower. If a tower is 150 foot and is available for collocation than that applicant's argument for future towers would be diminished. On the collocation side of things, as we talked about the federal regulations that govern cell tower placement and development, I will note that part of the middle class tax relief act of Feb. 2012, gives more authority to cell companies to collocate additional antennas on an expedited basis. Essentially, the city would have a 60 day review period of an application. Should the city fail to review in 60 days, the collocation is permitted. This is to have collocation sought after before looking at new tower placement.

The applicant asked for a 150 foot tower but if the Board feels that 125 foot tower would mitigate aesthetic resources but in doing so it may impact result in additional towers rather than collocating at that tower.

Tim Baroody- I think we have to assume that the RF engineers did a study from 110 to 150 feet.

Stephen Selvek- We do not have to assume. Our consultant reviewed the application information and determined that the 120 foot mounting height is reasonable and appropriate for the coverage need presented.

Chair asks board for additional comments or questions. None.

Stephen Selvek- Staff recommendation for the SEQRA based upon the information provided to you this evening is a negative declaration. A draft negative declaration resolution is drafted and is in your packets.

Chair asks for a motion to adopt the SEQRA Negative Declaration Resolution for 14 Allen Street so moved by Crystal Cosentino, second by Tim Baroody. Theresa Walsh opposed. All other members in favor. Motion carried.

Stephen Selvek- There is a draft modified approval resolution for the site plan and it includes the modification of a tower height reduced from 150 feet to 125 feet. This was in board packets and is something for the board to consider or the board may approval the application as presented. The information provided complies with zoning requirements. The applicant demonstrated the need and provided adequate propagation maps, our consultant reviewed the application materials and felt that the tower was appropriate at 120 foot mounting height. Staff recommendation is approval at 125 feet but I will leave it to the board if they would like to amend the draft resolution for the 150 foot tower or 125 feet.

Stacy DeForrest- I want to take a moment and remind the board of the legal standard that everyone needs to follow. The board has to follow federal regulations. If there is a denial of the application, substantial evidence must be presented and must be either a lack of need or lack of an adverse visual impact. So look at the information provided in the application, in the report, what did the balloon test show and use that as a basis for your decision if a denial is warranted.

If there are board members that wish to approve the application as submitted then the board needs to make a motion to amend the draft resolution and accept the application as submitted. If the board would like to pass the draft resolution with the 125 foot tower than a motion can be made for approval of the resolution as drafted.

Crystal Cosentino- If another cell company wanted to collocate do they need to come before a city board?

If a new applicant wanted to collocate on an existing pole they would need to submit information to the city that they comply with requirements 6409. If they comply with those requirements and there is not a substantial change in the tower the city can approve the building permit at that point. A substantial change is identified as either a greater of a 20 foot extension or 10% of the overall tower height.

Tim Baroody- Colocation is another vendor adding an antenna on the structure

Stephen Selvek- Yes that is what colocation is. If they needed to add an additional 30 or 40 feet than that standard would not apply, they would come back in front of this board and a 90 day clock would apply. If it is a brand new tower it is 150 days for review.

Andy Tehan- Can colocation occur at 120 feet?

Stephen Selvek- My understanding is that mounting hardware itself has to be spaced out from one antenna to another because of signal interference and also at a 360 degree spread. So at 120 feet another antenna is not likely. They would either need to go below at 110 feet or above 150 feet based on their propagation maps.

Anne McCarthy- Do most cell towers have colocation?

Stephen Selvek- We can ask the applicant to speak to that.

Andrew Leja- More and more are seeing colocation because of the increased use of these electronic devices. Whenever we can, as a tower developer, we want to see colocation. That is our first option.

Crystal Cosentino- Mr. Johnson pointed out that municipalities often like to see the colocations at one site rather than to conduct hearings for multiple shorter towers. I would rather see one tower than multiple towers. Where I fall is to one 150 foot tower than 120 or 125 foot tower and potentially have a future applicant come to put another tower in that area and clutter the skyline. I also would vote for this level as well but do not want to entertain this again where additional towers are being placed in the area.

Theresa Walsh- As to the advice of providing substantial evidence- consistency with community character and aesthetic resources is, to me, subjective.

Stacy DeForrest- The aesthetic considerations and evidence to that can be seen in the balloon test as well as the consideration of the other towers in the area and their heights compared to the applicants proposal. There are unsubjective ways to look at that. That is what you would need to use as your basis for denial, if you are going to.

Tim Baroody makes a motion to adopt the Site Plan Application as submitted for a 150 foot tower at 14 Allen Street.

Chair asks for a motion to adopt the Site Plan Application as submitted for 150 tower at 14 Allen Street so moved by Tim Baroody, second by Crystal Cosentino. Theresa Walsh opposed. All other members in favor. Motion carried.

Agenda Item 3: 68 North Division Street: Site Plan Review for the construction of a 31 vehicle parking lot. Applicant Glenn Fletcher.

Chair asks staff for comments.

Stephen Selvek- The application before us tonight has been through a couple of revisions. The applicant is here tonight and may address any questions if the board has any. The initial proposal was for 46 vehicles but to ensure that we are meeting storm water regulations and appropriate layout has resulted in the plan before us with 31 vehicles. These are standard parking spaces. The former plan had 46 spaces in which 25% of the spaces were for compact cars, our code does allow for that. However, this solution is good for the site and the applicant. Staff has reviewed the application and worked closely with the engineer on storm water management issues on C4 of site plan. The storm water will be directed to the south west corner of the property and will enter the storm water management pond and filter out slowly through a perforated tube. We have a combined sanitary storm water system so any surcharge of storm water is problematic. We are trying to mimic the current condition of the site and have water flow from the northeast to the southwest at the same rate as it does now. The applicant included a photometric plan for building mounted wall packs and complies with our requirements to mitigate light spillage onto neighboring properties.

Stephen Selvek Reviews SEQRA form. Part II of the Short Environmental Assessment Form is noted as having no impact or potential for small/moderate impact on all questions. In part III it is noted the proposed action includes the construction of a 31 vehicle parking lot measuring approximately 12,000 SF. The existing use is permitted at the site in accordance with a use-variance previously approved by the City of Auburn Zoning Board of Appeals. The proposed plans includes stormwater management

improvements to mitigate possible stormwater runoff impacts. The new parking lot will provide off-street parking for events at Euterpe Hall thereby reducing the amount of on-street parking and the impact to the adjacent residential property.

Staff recommendation is for approval of the SEQRA Negative Declaration Resolution and approval of the site plan as submitted dated February 8th 2016 and revised on February 25th.

Chair asks if the Board has comments or questions.

Andy Tehan- Questions what the snow removal plan is since it is a tight area.

Neil Zinsmayer, Napierala Consulting- By reducing the parking spaces we increased the green space and can use that for snow storage. There is also a depression there that will be used for snow storage.

Stephen Selvek- The distance from North Division Street is significant. There is adequate space for snow storage along the edges of the parking lot as well.

Chair asks for a motion to adopt the SEQRA Negative Declaration Resolution for 68 North Division Street so moved by Crystal Cosentino, second by Theresa Walsh. All members in favor. Motion carried.

Chair asks for a motion to adopt the Site Plan Resolution for 68 North Division Street so moved by Andy Tehan, second by Crystal Cosentino. All members in favor. Motion carried.

Stephen Selvek announces to the public that the 44 York Street application is not on this month's agenda since the Planning Board did not receive anything new.

Agenda Item 4: 217 Genesee Street: Site Plan Review for the conversion of West Middle School into 59 apartments, on-site office space, and additional parking spaces. Applicant Susan Kimmel for Lakewood Development II LLC.

Chair invites applicant to present the project.

Stephen Selvek- Requests Ed to speak to the last minute changes that were made to the site plan.

Ed Keplinger, Keplinger Freeman Associates 6320 Fly Road East Syracuse-

- First and most notable change is the reduction of parking in front of the school. We eliminated the demolition of the existing sidewalks and the expansion of the asphalt pavement. We left all of that in place and now have parallel parking along the curb line. We went from 20 down to 7 parking spaces in the front. We would like to get to 110 parking spaces. There are 100 spaces and to get to 110, we picked up seven in front and added four parking spaces in the service area. We did lose one parking spot in the east lot because of emergency ingress/egress.

- We added considerable amount of landscaping along the west and north end of the school. We added lower shrubs as well in between residential properties and the parking lot.

- On the east side entrance we added a fire hydrant.

- The existing utilities were reviewed by the design team and they are capable in serving the future use of the building.

Stephen Selvek- I received a call from a resident on Pleasant Street concerned with traffic impacts to Pleasant Street. Specifically, people exiting the parking lot to Pleasant Street rather than Genesee Street.

The city would like the Pleasant Street access to be used as for emergency, primarily for fire response. This would be similar to the senior living complex off of Standart where the emergency access is off Catlin but the primary access is off of Standart. The police department, fire, ourselves, and the applicant discussed a gated entrance to serve solely as an emergency access and the fire department would have keys to access that. The design would still allow residents to walk between Pleasant Street and the complex which would maintain pedestrian access but limit vehicular access.

Ed Keplinger- Yes, we agree to that.

Stephen Selvek- Since this was discussed last minute I would like to have a motion be made to include a limited access at Pleasant Street for emergency vehicles only while maintaining pedestrian access to be approved by board staff and the fire department into the site plan resolution.

Stephen Selvek- Reviews SEQRA. In part II of the Short EAF I noted that the answers to 1-11 are no or small impact, indicating there are no significant adverse environmental impacts. There are existing g utilities and it has been confirmed that the utilities are appropriate for this type of development. Reads part III: The proposed action includes the conversion of the former West Middle School at 217 Genesee Street into 59 one and two-bedroom apartments and on-site office space. The proposed use is permitted at the site in accordance with a use-variance previously approved by the City of Auburn Zoning Board of Appeals. Exterior alterations are very limited in scope and include, removal of signage, landscaping, fire hydrant placement, installation of a trash dumpster enclosure, and parking lot striping. The intent of the project is to preserve the exterior appearance of the building.

Staff recommends the Negative Declaration SEQRA Resolution and approval of the site plan with the modification discussed tonight.

Chair asks for board questions and comments.

Crystal Cosentino questions the funding and if Unity House will still move forward with the project if you do not receive State HCR funding?

Susan Kimmel- No, it is a whole package project. In fact the financing for the project includes acquisition so if we do not receive funding we cannot purchase the building. Also this is bond financing so we are looking at a timeframe of June or July.

Chair asks for a motion to adopt the SEQRA Negative Declaration Resolution for 217 Genesee Street so moved by Crystal Cosentino, second by Theresa Walsh. All members in favor. Motion carried.

Chair asks for a motion to adopt the Site Plan Resolution with modifications for 217 Genesee Street so moved by Andy Tehan, second by Crystal Cosentino. All members in favor. Motion carried.

Other Items:

The date of the next Planning Board meeting is Tuesday, April 5, 2016 at 6:30 pm.

Motion to adjourn made by Theresa Walsh and seconded by Tim Baroody. All in Favor.

Respectively submitted by Renee Jensen