

TOWN OF GATES  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
September 25, 2017

The regular meeting of the Gates Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 PM by Chairman Wall.

PRESENT MEMBERS: M. Wall, Chairman; T. May, D. Cambisi, K. Rappazzo, D. Chamberlain, J. Argenta, Daniel Schum, Town Attorney; L. Sinnebox, Town Engineer; Lee Cordero, Councilman

ABSENT MEMBERS: G. Lillie, J. Amico

The first matter on the agenda was approval of the June 26, 2017 Planning Board Minutes.

Mr. Argenta made a motion to approve the minutes as received. Ms. May seconded the motion. All were in favor; the motion carried.

**MINI STORAGE**

**OWNER: 142 Buell, LLC**

**LOCATION: 142 Buell Road**

**ENGINEER: T.Y. Lin International**

**RE-SUBDIVISION MAP REVIEW**

**G.I. (General Industrial Zone)**

**PRELIMINARY SITE APPROVAL**

Randy Bebout of T.Y. Lin International was representing this project. With him this evening is Todd Longo of 142 Buell, LLC. He stated they were here tonight to talk about 390 Self Storage of Rochester, which is the new official name for this project. They are here for Re-Subdivision Map Review and Preliminary Site Approval.

This project is a 9.3 acre parcel. It is zoned General Industrial and they are looking to do self-storage. The project consists of a climate controlled 17,000 sq. ft. building on the north end and attached to that is a 600-sq. ft. office, there is 25 individual storage units going from north to south. The total storage square footage is 102,050 sf.

He went on to say they have 8 parking spaces proposed and one of those is an accessible space. They are asking a Preliminary Site Approval for the entire project but they will phase the construction. The first phase will consist of climate controlled building and office and then 4 individual storage buildings. To the south of those individual storage buildings will be a crushed-stone outdoor storage area. As explained last time, the outdoor storage area will move as they build the sequential storage buildings. He estimates a building or two a year.

Mr. Bebout continued by saying they have a 20 ft. green area along the east side. Originally there was a 20 ft. green area along the west side but they have increased that to 25 ft. That was a product of trying to get the dry swale as part of our SWPPP design to fit in there and to match into the existing grades. As a result of that they shortened the buildings by 5 ft.

Mr. Bebout continued to speak about the proposed lighting. He said there will be building lighting and a light pole in the storage area. A small amount of landscaping is shown around the utility structure out front, which will house the master meter. Landscaping is also proposed along the front of the climate controlled building and near the office along the east side of the climate controlled building. They have since added landscaping along the east and north half of the building. That was a result of communication from SHPO. They were asking about vegetation on the site. We have since responded to SHPO indicating that, given the site perimeters, that there won't be any vegetation left on this site mainly because of the dry soil and the storm water features that we will have to provide. No response back from SHPO as of tonight.

Mr. Bebout said they were showing one storm feature on the north end and there was a comment from the town engineer whether that would be satisfactory to handle this storm water coming in on this site. He said they sort of knew that it may not but they had to dive into details. He stated as well that they have been in communication with the Canal Corporation and NYS DEC and it was determined that they do not have to do detention from this site being that it is discharging directly to canal. The DEC has confirmed that. The Canal Corporation is good with that too. Last week infiltration testing was done on both the north and south ends. He said they are in the process of putting together the storm water report which will be submitted to the Town and then submitted back to Canal Corporation. He went on to say that they did appear before the Zoning Board on August 14<sup>th</sup> to ask for a variance for front setback from Interstate 390. They asked for 40 ft. and it was granted. And for the most part he said they are at 45 ft. They are working to get their submissions in to the county agencies, Monroe County Water Authority, The Health Dept., Pure Waters and Monroe County DOT.

Mr. Bebout continued to say that on August 10<sup>th</sup> there was a notation that the site is located in the Greater Rochester International Airport area and they reviewed the application and essentially has granted approval for that.

Mr. Bebout went on to say that they did not bring building materials with them this evening but will have them at the next meeting. They are still trying to refine some of those materials. He spoke about turnaround areas and said that they have addressed some of the concept meeting comments.

Ms. May asked for color samples. Mr. Bebout restated that they did not bring building materials with them this evening but will have them at the next meeting.

Mr. Argenta asked about the chain link fencing and vinyl fencing along the canal. Mr. Bebout stated that they have added a dumpster to the plans at the southeast corner. Two sides is a vinyl fence and are proposing a chain link fence along the east property line.

Mr. Chamberlain asked about the vinyl fencing and chain link fencing. Mr. Bebout said it is separated by 20 ft. The vinyl fencing will be for the dumpster enclosure.

Mr. Argenta asked if the 102,050 sq. ft. measurement of the building is what it will be when completed. Mr. Bebout answered that yes, that is the complete square footage. He went on to say that the first phase is 29,000 sq. ft. There will be a 600 sq. ft. office, 17,000 sq. ft. climate controlled building and then the first four buildings which are 2,850 sq. ft.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the dumpster enclosure needs to be a masonry enclosure. The town does not allow a chain link fence or a vinyl fence enclosure. Mr. Bebout asked if that is the town standard and Mr. Chamberlain replied yes it has been for years.

Mr. Chamberlain asked how they will gain access to this area. Mr. Bebout stated that they would have to let them in. They will come during working hours.

Mr. Todd Longo, one of the owners of the property stated that they can just pull in and get the container and therefore users of the unit will have access to it. For security they will have to go through the gate. He then asked if the building is masonry on one side then would that be ok? Then they can add a masonry wall on the other side.

Mr. Argenta said yes. Two sides would have to be masonry and the other side is the building that is masonry. Having masonry walls makes it a more sound construction.

Mr. Chamberlain asked if the building was going to be masonry or steel. Mr. Bebout stated that the building would be steel. Mr. Chamberlain then asked about the individual storage buildings. Mr. Bebout answered that

they would be metal. Mr. Chamberlain then stated that that brings up the point then about bollards to protect those buildings.

Mr. Bebout stated that they will be putting bollards in and will show it on the plan.

Mr. Chamberlain added that they need a detail of the bollards and also a detail of the dumpster enclosure in the plans.

Mr. Chamberlain asked if they have notified Buckeye Pipeline about their project. Mr. Bebout answered yes. When looking at the property they spoke with a gentleman from Buckeye. They have been in contact with him.

Mr. Chamberlain also stated that the location of the construction entrance needs to be shown on the plans. Mr. Bebout will have it in the final plan.

Mr. Chamberlain asked to see more topography out at the expressway to see what actually are the conditions. Mr. Bebout said no what was submitted on the plans is what they have. They are tied into the grades on their property line. The water that sheets down that embankment will sheet into our storm water pond.

Mr. Chamberlain asked about radiuses for the road. Mr. Bebout assured him that it will be on the final plan. Mr. Chamberlain then went on to ask why there is only a ten foot wide access where they are going to put in the gate. Mr. Bebout corrected him by stated that it is 14 ft.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that a detail of the gate mechanism is also needed. He also asked about the concrete curb only on one side. Mr. Bebout went on to say they have changed that and putting in a gutter now.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that no roof leaders are shown coming off into the storm system for any of the buildings. Mr. Bebout said that on the climate controlled building they are discharging that. Mr. Chamberlain apologized. It was on the plan.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that he would like to see a concrete washout detail on the plans. Mr. Bebout stated they will be on the plans.

Mr. Schum stated that the parcel really doesn't have the free access to Buell Road and it references a 25 ft. access easement. The proposed roadway veers around the proposed utility structure outside of the easement area. Mr. Bebout said that there is an easement on the original boundary map that they received.

Mr. Schum stated that they have made reference to 2 easements on the C1 map. He would like to see both of those to review them. Mr. Bebout agreed.

Mr. Rappazzo asked if it was the intent to install all stormwater stuff in the first phase? Mr. Bebout answered yes. The idea would be that all the info structure is done and then it's a matter of them coming in and pulling a building permit to build their next building. Mr. Rappazzo asked if when they do their revision plans and show the fence across the back, he recommends that they put a fence there so that they can access those areas.

Mr. Rappazzo asked if the area would be cleared for the first phase. Mr. Bebout answered yes. The entire site will be rough graded in the first phase.

Mr. Rappazzo asked what the intent was for signage on the site. Mr. Bebout said there will be a sign on the building. Looking at doing a glorified shed to put signage on that building. The sign on the building is for 390.

Mr. Rappazzo went on to ask about discharge to the canal. He stated that it looks like they are discharging into a swale that discharges into a pipe that discharges into the canal. He asked if there is any concern from either

the Canal Authority or the DOT of them not providing water quantity mitigation and flooding capacity. Mr. Bebout stated that not at this point there is not. They believe there is no issue there.

Mr. Rappazzo asked if the Fire Marshal had any comments about the 20 ft. aisle width on either side? Mr. Bebout stated that not on the initial comments. Mr. Rappazzo just wants to make sure that the Fire Marshal is ok with that. Mr. Bebout stated that there will always be a turnaround.

Ms. May asked how many storage units there will be. Mr. Bebout stated there will be 25 individual buildings the 30 ft. wide buildings. There was 26 on the original concept.

Mr. Wall asked about the test pits. There is a note that the hydraulic line prevented exploration beyond 52 inches on the 5<sup>th</sup> hole. Are there plans to go out and finish up. Mr. Bebout stated that with the 4 holes they dug they saw that it was very sandy and did not hit any water with the holes. The holes were redone last week and did infiltration testing and at depth they did not hit any water. They do not anticipate doing anymore holes.

Mr. Wall asked if the proposed 24 inch pipe driveway culvert has been designed to take into consideration the existing swale-slope? Mr. Bebout stated they will back-check the design.

Mr. Sinsebox stated that there are 2 applications on this project, the first being the subdivision and the re-subdivision application that is considered an unlisted action and we do not have any comments on the re-sub so SEQR and approval can be handled separate for that. On the site plan, regarding SEQR, we are going to suggest we do a coordinated review – we submit the plans and application to any involved agency that has approval authority over this project with a letter stating that it is this Board's intent to take the lead regarding SEQR but inviting them to take the lead should they choose to. They have 30 days to respond to that letter. Then the Board can appoint themselves lead agency if no other agency wants to do that. He also stated that he has identified 5 agencies involved, one being The Canal Corporation, NYS DEC, Monroe County Water Authority, Monroe County Pure Waters and Monroe County Health Dept. He stated that he can prepare the letter should they choose to do the coordinated review on SEQR.

Mr. Sinsebox had some general comments: the drainage report is under review and is just about done with it and will have some comments early next week for the engineer. He mentioned a couple of things that are critical at this point – under sub-catchments drainage shed areas and the developed conditions of the proposed conditions – DA1, down the center of the site, needs to include the offsite area that is draining on to this site from the expressway. He believes even the northbound lane of the expressway drains down over the bank right down to the site. Because they are capturing drainage with that swale and sending it to the storm water management facility, they have to include that volume of water that is coming onto the site. The other thing is the outflow pipe at the south end that leads over to the canal will need to be checked for capacity. They are collecting all of the drainage from this site including the areas that used to soak into the ground through the low points so they are creating a considerable amount of additional flow. Make sure the pipe has capacity. It should show that in its entire length all the way to the canal. Any drainage that is leaving this site going to the canal a detailed topographic flow path to the canal is needed.

Mr. Rappazzo asked if the infiltration tests are that positive, is the infiltration basin something that can be done here to totally eliminate flow from off the site. Mr. Sinsebox said yes. He went on to say that he just wants to make sure that all of the drainage from this site and the offsite area coming into this site is accounted for. The drainage does not stop at the east boundary line.

Mr. Bebout stated that they have a shot on the culvert that goes to the canal. The survey stops at the east side of the canal path. It is satisfactory he asks. Mr. Sinsebox stated no because there is a question and it may come up through the Canal Corporation what the definition of a direct connection to drainage to the canal, and he thinks that if they drain to a pipe that leads to a canal, that is not a direct discharge. They may want to get clarification on that. It appears that the pipe will collect any overflow of their whole system and need to make sure that it has capacity including all the other drainage that is going to that pipe and that the pipe doesn't back up and

cause flooding in another area. Mr. Chamberlain stated that the 24 inch pipe goes into a 4 ft. wide concrete sluice that goes to the canal. There is another sluice that is not being used, there is no pipe to it and is 418 ft. to the north of that. He suggested they could possibly use that one. It's condition is questionable, but they would have to put in a pipe under the walkway, the bicycle path-walking path to the canal.

Mr. Sinsebox added that while they are doing their existing compared to their proposed runoff values, we would like each discharge point to be evaluated. In other words, he stated that they have 3 or 4 low points that is receiving flow and goes onto the site and disappears, so under existing conditions that would have a sub catchment area draining to there showing the volume of water that goes there under existing conditions. Under developed conditions, that area has to be accounted for under another sub catchment and that volume goes to a storm water management facility and maybe to a different discharge point. So it has to be tracked to the next discharge point.

Mr. Wall asked if Mr. Sinsebox has those points in writing. Mr. Sinsebox stated that Mr. Wall will have them either Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. Bebout asked if they need to get more survey based on what they see. Mr. Sinsebox stated yes. Mr. Bebout asked if they wanted to see the slopes and Mr. Sinsebox stated that pretty much at the end of that pipe where all the drainage is going, how far from the edge of the canal when the foam comes out of that does it go right over the bank of the canal or does it punch through another pipe to the canal. He stated that it should be detailed very carefully and that may impact whether it is considered a direct discharge to the canal or an indirect discharge to the canal.

Mr. Rappazzo asked if there could there be a possible tail water condition on this pipe? Mr. Sinsebox stated that he did not think so. He said that the canal has considerable fall from the surface down to the canal level and not where the water is going and the river does not affect the canal water that much. There is probably 15 ft. of freeboard to overcome that.

Mr. Chamberlain stated his concern that the plan is on the wrong size sheet of paper and it doesn't meet any of the standards. Mr. Bebout stated that it is a preliminary sub-map. Mr. Chamberlain stated that preliminary doesn't show up on the map. Mr. Chamberlain said that they cannot pass on this without a correct sub-map. Mr. Bebout answered that they will submit a map that meets the requirements at the next meeting.

Mr. Schum stated that the Board would have no objection to the re-subdivision map if it is properly depicted.

At this point the Planning Board was declared in Executive Session. After discussion among the Board Members, Mr. Wall made a motion to **TABLE** the Re-Subdivision Map Review and Preliminary Site Approval for 142 Buell, LLC and Ms. May seconded the motion based on the applicant providing the outstanding information including:

1. Because the project is bounded by the canal and NYS. Rte. 390, with the stormwater discharge to the canal, letters will be sent to the following Agencies for a coordinated review: Canal Corp, NYSDEC, MCWA, MCPW, and MCDOT. It is the Board's understanding that there have been initial communication between the Canal Corp, NYDEC, and your office. To help the project along, the Town will seek response letters from the Agencies before 30-days to determine Lead Agency as soon as possible.
2. Please address any outstanding comments from the Concept Review dated June 26, 2017, any outstanding comments from the Fire Marshal, and any outstanding comments from the Town Engineer's comments in a letter dated June 21, 2017.
3. The Applicant is review the Town's Site Application Checklists and provide the technical information with the application Final Approval.
4. Please provide Building Sample Materials at the next meeting.

5. Please provide Building Elevations for the Storage Building and the Utility Structure.
6. Please provide the following details and add the location to the Site Plans:
  - a. Masonry Enclosure,
  - b. Bollards,
  - c. Construction Entrance,
  - d. Concrete Washout Area,
  - e. Front Security Gate with Fire Department Access,
  - f. Catch basin (per Town Standards), and
  - g. Heavy Duty Pavement.
7. Please add a Construction Sequence to the plans.
8. Please investigate the slope of the proposed 24" culvert at the entrance driveway and the existing conditions. Concern is that the addition of a pipe, at a steeper grade than the existing swale, may cause a negative drainage impact downstream.
9. Over the sequential construction phases, it is understood that the rear fence line will be relocated as the site is developed to the south. Please add an access gate to the rear fence line. The intent of this gate to provide an access for storm water maintenance that are constructed with Phase I.
10. Please address the Town Engineer's SWPPP comments (submitted under a separate cover). Two of the comments discussed at the meeting were that Drainage area DA-1 should include the off-site area, and capacity of the outflow pipe to the canal should be investigated.
11. Please investigate any applicable storm water infiltration practices that would benefit the development.

There being no further business to come before the Planning Board, Chairman Wall adjourned the meeting at 8:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda M. Saraceni  
Recording Secretary