

TOWN OF ELMA PLANNING BOARD

1600 Bowen Road, Elma, New York 14059

Phone: 716-652-3260

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING ~ AUGUST 15, 2017

The Regular Meeting of the Town of Elma Planning Board, hereinafter referred to as the EPB, was held on Tuesday, August 15, 2017 at 7:00 PM in the Elma Town Hall at 1600 Bowen Road, Elma, New York.

PRESENT:

Chairman Michael Cirocco

Member David Baker

Member Michael Cleary

Member Gregory Merkle

Member Charles Putzbach

Member Robert Waver

Alternate Thomas Reid

TOWN REPRESENTATIVES:

Raymond Balcerzak, Asst. Building Inspector

Phyllis Todoro, Town Attorney

James Wyzykiewicz, Town Engineer

ABSENT:

Member James Millard

I. APPROVAL OF REGULAR MEETING MINUTES ~ JUNE 20, 2017

Motion made by Gregory Merkle and second by Michael Cleary to approve the Minutes of the EPB Regular Meeting held on June 20, 2017. Motion Carried.

II. SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR ANNUNCIATION ROMAN CATHOLIC PARISH CAMPUS MASTER PLAN – ENLARGED CEMETERY – NEW STORAGE/PAVILLION STRUCTURE AND NEW PLAYGROUNDS LOCATED AT 7580 CLINTON STREET

Pastor, Eugene Ulrich introduced himself to the Elma Planning Board and explained he has been a pastor for around 43 years and with Annunciation Church for the past 10 years. Over 2 years ago, we engaged parish leadership of our societies and organization and asked them how Annunciation Church needs to invest our money in our parish campus that would sustain our mission with a beautiful place to worship and also preserve the community and the quality of the property value. After listening and engaging our parishioners and coming together Annunciation Church has a sense of what it should be. Annunciation Church has also sought counsel from the Diocese of Buffalo and their building and properties plus the cemetery of the Dioceses. Annunciation Church has also engaged in an Architect, Thomas Kujawa who is here today with a cemetery plan. Annunciation Church has looked at our entire canvas to make sure what we are doing is a wise investment of our resources for the good of our parish and the good of our community.

II. SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR ANNUNCIATION ROMAN CATHOLIC PARISH CAMPUS MASTER PLAN – ENLARGED CEMETERY – NEW STORAGE/PAVILLION STRUCTURE AND NEW PLAYGROUNDS LOCATED AT 7580 CLINTON STREET (cont.)

The parish has held multiple meetings with the surrounding neighbors. A letter was sent to the neighbors on Roycroft, Girdle and Schwartz Roads and invited them to a meeting and presentation of proposed plans on June 15th, 2017 and a Parish Town Hall meeting was held on June 19th, 2017. A preliminary design review meeting was held on June 26th 2017 with the Town Supervisor and the Town Building Inspector. The church has also corresponded with the owners of Amigone Funeral Home. All concerns from all meetings have been incorporated into final drawing submissions.

Deacon Jim Jaworski from Annunciation Church introduced himself to the Elma Planning Board. I have been involved in this process for the last two years. The parish has been around for 112 years and the cemetery is 111 years old. Since we have been here for over 100 years we are looking at the next 100 years and we wanted to see what is best for our campus. Annunciation Church decided to start with the cemetery. Families have entrusted us with about 1000 of their family and friends in our cemetery. Deacon Jim Jaworski stated that currently 60% of our burials are cremations so our proposed plan of columbarium niches for creative remains will address this concern. Our proposed committal shelter will also have spots for cremates. If you look at our cemetery there is currently a dilapidated maintenance garage and a storage shed and a pavilion that is 35 years old and is falling apart. These are the reason for the proposed master plan for our Enlarged Cemetery – New Storage/Pavilion Structure – New Playgrounds for Annunciation Roman Catholic Church. The storage shed/garage and pavilion would be in one footprint to take us less space. The storage shed will house our tractor, grass cutters and snow blowers. It will also house our Cub Scouts and Boy Scouts for storage of their equipment and camping gear. It will have bathrooms and a small commercial kitchen. The pavilion will have room for between 100-150 people. “The parish sees the project as a sign of growth and vitality. The upgrading of our facilities enhances our campus and adds value not only to the parish but also for our neighbors going into the foreseeable future.” – Deacon Jim Jaworski.

Thomas Kujawa, RA, AIA of K-Arc Design Architects, PLLC introduced himself to the Elma Planning Board and reviewed the following proposal that was submitted to the Town of Elma Planning Board members. The first part is the demolition of the existing structures of the storage garage building, beer shelter and open pavilion structure. Next step was to figure out where to position the new structure on our campus. There is no more room on the church campus, or the school parcel. The parcel on Schwartz was the farthest spot from the school and parish community. The south-west campus made the most sense being the closet to the parish and there is already parking on site. The current Annunciation Campus consists of 5 property parcels, encompassing all four corners of Clinton, Girdle, and Swartz intersections. The site is zoned “C1” and is approximately 12.87 acres. The setbacks are 50’ from the front and 10’ from rear and the side and 46’ from the rear. The one side is 80’ and 140’ from Roycroft side and 150’ from Girdle Road. The building itself is less than 5000 square feet and it will have arch stone and wood overhangs and gable ends with wood siding. The storage building is estimated at 2700 square feet and the pavilion is estimated at 2200 square feet. Our project was approved at the Zoning Board Meeting on August 8th, 2017 for the zoning variance for the additional 1935 square feet.

II. SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR ANNUNCIATION ROMAN CATHOLIC PARISH CAMPUS MASTER PLAN – ENLARGED CEMETERY – NEW STORAGE/PAVILLION STRUCTURE AND NEW PLAYGROUNDS LOCATED AT 7580 CLINTON STREET (cont.)

The proposed plan includes the following:

- 1) Demolition of non-historic, and of various levels of deterioration, storage garage building, beer shelter building, and open pavilion structure.*
- 2) Expansion of the existing cemetery to include new landscaping, columbarium niches for cremated remains, new prayerful and meditative spaces.*
- 3) New Loop “Road” driveway connecting the existing driveway alongside the school, back to the cemetery, and back around to the parking lot for hearse and pedestrian access to the cemetery.*
- 4) New construction of a 640 square feet Committal Shelter (made of concrete, metal roof and wood) with the new cemetery design space.*
- 5) New construction of a 2415 square feet storage building and 3588 square feet open pavilion and building overhangs structure on the campus owned parcel at the South-West corner of Clinton Street and Girdle Road.*
- 6) Demolition of existing remote playground structure and the installation of a new playground structure in the courtyard of the existing school buildings. Design has not been submitted yet. The playground will be for the preschool/daycare facility.*
- 7) New Landscape features, fencing, access driveways and sidewalks for storage/pavilion building.*

Mr. Kujawa stated that a future phase we will look at is signage at the four corners.

Chairman Cirocco explained to the residents that the Elma Planning Board is responsible for reviewing the Site Plan layout and determine if the applicant is a suitable use for the zoning and the neighborhood and if it fits the surrounding neighborhood. The EPB will review lighting, parking, traffic patterns, drainage, signage, landscaping and how the property is going to be used. The EPB will make recommendations for changes or we will have the applicant come back and ask for a checklist of items to be completed. The EPB can give Site Plan Approval based upon them meeting the requirements of the checklist and the Elma Town Code. This is not a public hearing but we will open up the floor for input from the residents. The goal tonight is to review the plan and decide which items on the checklist they are missing and have the applicant come back to review again.

Mr. Baker asked Deacon Jim Jaworski to explain what is new and what niches are. Deacon Jim Jaworski explained that in the existing cemetery we have about 1000 burial plots within the existing cemetery. A burial plot is for one casket and usually people buy next to one another so there is two. With 60% of our Burials are cremates which means that remains that are cremated and put in an urn or a suitable container. The niches are going to offer two things, there will be inground burial of urns which is 2'x2'x2' or you will be able to go into the columbarium which one columbarium niche fits two sets of cremates. The columbarium is a structure with lockers that the urns will go into. All items in the new expansion will be cremates. The committal shelter also has spot in the wall for cremates.

II. SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR ANNUNCIATION ROMAN CATHOLIC PARISH CAMPUS MASTER PLAN – ENLARGED CEMETERY – NEW STORAGE/PAVILLION STRUCTURE AND NEW PLAYGROUNDS LOCATED AT 7580 CLINTON STREET (cont.)

Tom Reid asked about the feedback from the public hearings on the Roycroft side? There are folks that had concerns that were brought to the churches attention and the church did listen to the concerns. Chairman Cirocco stated that you are moving the area for events closer to them and the responsibility of the EPB is to find compromise for their concerns. The Elma Town Code §117-4 is in reference to make sure the residents are protected. The EPB stated anything you can do to mitigate the impact on the neighbors is discussions that we will have. Mr. Kujawa stated that we moved the pavilion 3 times on the lot and this proposed plan was our best scenario. By us moving the pavilion over to the soccer field parcel people will not be parking in the current soccer field. This will open up the front of the school for parking which is about 80 spots. The church will look into additional police presence being available. Chairman Cirocco asked if there are any other questions from the EPB besides the three-day event at this time? The EPB asked Deacon Jaworksi is there are any other events that will be held there? Deacon Jaworski stated no wedding receptions just social events of the parish. The audience was asked if anyone had concerns regarding the plans, not the 3-day event at this time.

Patricia Dowling of 70 Roycroft stated at the meetings we were never informed that the beer tent will be moved in this area. At this time the EPB wants to know if residents have any concern with the plans, not just the 3-day event. Patricia Dowling asked how do we know that other events will not be allowed in the future?

Laura Mendolera @ 3 Roycroft has concerns with people walking into their property. A huge concern is no fencing or berms being put near our property. Can they do something in the back to minimize the noise? Heavy machinery is being stored there also and can we do time restrictions on noise from this machinery? At the church meeting it was addressed as to how are you going to recoup the money for this expense? They said they are going to rent it out and now the story is changing. At the meeting it was asked why can't the pavilion be moved into the empty plot? It was mentioned that it could not be used due to large amounts of fill would be needed. I know for a fact that The Property Brothers would donate fill and Forbes Capretto is doing a lot in the area that they could maybe donate. Has this ever been evaluated?

Deacon Jaworkski stated this pavilion will not be rented. The other reason for the empty plot not being used is that it is not the best solution due to parking and not close to the school and has no infrastructure.

Mrs. Brown @ 60 Roycroft wanted to state that maintenance of the church property is not being addressed. Tree branches not being cleared and on the cemetery side branches just lying there along with papers. The evergreens are full of weeds and need to be cared for.

II. SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR ANNUNCIATION ROMAN CATHOLIC PARISH CAMPUS MASTER PLAN – ENLARGED CEMETERY – NEW STORAGE/PAVILLION STRUCTURE AND NEW PLAYGROUNDS LOCATED AT 7580 CLINTON STREET (cont.)

The EPB thanked the residents for their input and the EPB has similar concerns. As mentioned the building was moved 3 times on the site from feedback from the residents. Mr. Kujawa noted that the pavilion needs yard space and they did not want to take down any trees. At this time the EPB will review the checklist.

- 1. Business Use Permit – Not required because it is not a business*
- 2. Zoning is C-1 on all corners*
- 3. Site & Building Details are all complete*
- 4. Lighting: Lighting maps with photo metrics are required on final site plans. Lighting details must include the hours the lighting will be on. Screening includes bulbs covered and nothing visible, nothing facing out and show the visibility of lighting. If it is shielded the residents will not see the lighting in their yards.*
- 5. Parking: Provide estimate of available parking on the final site plans.*
- 6. Drainage: Drainage plan will need to be provided.*
- 7. Signage: Not ready at this time, it will be a later date. Will contact Elma Building Department when ready for a sign.*
- 8. Landscaping/Screening: If additional screening/vegetation is added make sure it is noted on the final site plans. The EPB wants the Southwest corner addressed regarding the residents' concerns near Roycroft. The residents have asked for fencing. There will be no dumpster on this site.*
- 9. Water Service & Septic/Sanitation: Show locations of fire hydrants on final site plans. Letters will be needed from Elma Water Department, and EC Department of Health and perk tests due to bathrooms being added. Identify location of septic/sanitation on the final site plans.*
- 10. Fire Department: Submit letter from Elma Fire Department stating they have no concerns with the project.*

The EPB asked if there will be any outdoor storage and it was noted that there will be no outdoor storage. It was recommended by the Mr. Reid that to show good neighbor policy during this onetime 3-day event that you will have a plan in place and explain special precautions to the residents at the next Elma Planning Board meeting you return to. The EPB had no other questions or concerns to be addressed.

A motion was made for Preliminary Site Plan Approval by Mr. Putzbach and seconded by Mr. Waver. Yes-7 No-0. Motion Carried

The EPB explained that the next step for Annunciation Church is to recognize the list of things we have identified and then call the Building Department to return for another EPB meeting once these items are completed.

III. SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR (2) 2970 SQUARE FEET STORAGE BUILDINGS (CHANGE IN SIZE/LOCATION FOR 1 BUILDING) LOCATED AT 6411 SENECA STREET

Mark Subject, Property Owner and Todd Huber, Contractor are returning to move forward with 2 storage buildings on the west side of the property behind the duplex on 6411 Seneca Street. The driveway is on the south side of the property and in the previous meeting the second building was perpendicular and we have now turned it so you may drive straight into it. Mr. Huber stated we have received an approval letter from the Springbrook Fire Department as well as the EC Health Department regarding septic system approval letter. Mr. Huber mentioned the other issue was the water flow that butts to the southeast of the property line and we have put together a drainage easement with Mrs. Dorothy Zilliox property and Mr. Sahlens property that picks up the water that is discharged from the East Aurora side of the property. There is a copy of the easement articulation in your packet that was signed by both property owners, Mrs. Zilliox and Mr. Sahlen. The building design and color scheme is in keeping with Mr. Subjects buildings which is tan/brown and cultured stone on the face will be part of the new construction. The lighting is delineated in your packet as well as the area that the light will be cast.

Chairman Cirocco had a concern whether it was a buildable lot based upon the frontage and if It is grandfathered in. The fire code requires 20' width of access regarding the code and it states that you must have an approval letter from the Fire Department. The Springbrook Fire Department has given an approval letter. There was questions regarding square footage whether it applies to a single structure or two structures. According to §144-71 Both buildings are less than 3000 square feet and total area of structure not to exceed 6000 square feet and that falls within the guidelines.

The EPB asked If anything else changed? Mr. Huber stated I changed the building to back up to Mrs. Zilliox property line as where prior to it was straight on. Chairman Cirocco stated that you moved the buildings closer to the existing duplex and rotated one of them. The EPB inquired if the septic is existing and Mr. Huber stated it is existing. Chairman Cirocco has a concern with 12' between the side of the existing duplex and the property line and take off the 2' overhang and 1' from the side setback you now have a 9' driveway. I do not like the 16' sidewalls the 18' height and I do not think it fits the site. Chairman Cirocco asked the use of this building? Mr. Subject stated that the use if for storage and the 14' feet wide doors you need to move in and out easily. Chairman Cirocco stated you would not build it that high for storing just vehicles. Mr. Huber stated the site dictates the type of tenant that Mr. Subject will use it for. Chairman Cirocco has concerns with 14' existing doors and 16' side walls and it was asked again what will the exact storage be of? Mr. Subject said a 14' overhead door is required when an RV is 13'. This will make it easier to move an RV in and out. Chairman Cirocco has a concern with getting an RV in the driveway. The Springbrook Fire Department has submitted and approval letter regarding this subject and had no issues.

Chairman Cirocco stated the concerns that I have are throughout the town that we are beginning to allow too many storage buildings to be placed on commercial sites that basically have a residential use. We have three or four that have been approved that are allowing commercial buildings to be placed behind homes because of their commercial zone. I don't feel that this site violates any of our town codes but there are a couple of areas I feel can be interpreted in one way or another. Chairman Cirocco's opinion is when we approve something an applicant will come back and say we allowed it here so we have to allow it for them. Chairman Cirocco does not feel comfortable with the size of this lot, the placement of this lot where it is as in relation to the surrounding residents. I do not feel comfortable with the drainage crossing two properties to basically drain into a shared off site drainage location. I will not question the integrity or the knowledge of a Fire Chief, but I have serious concerns about fire access.

III. SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR (2) 2970 SQUARE FEET STORAGE BUILDINGS (CHANGE IN SIZE/LOCATION FOR 1 BUILDING) LOCATED AT 6411 SENECA STREET (cont.)

If the EPB were to approve this Chairman Cirocco feels the board is shoehorning for no other reason but to benefit the applicant. Chairman Cirocco stated if you look around Elma we have old Bullis Road and numerous sites in town where there are residential uses on commercial lots. Is the Town of Elma now going to have two storage buildings behind every home in a commercial lot in Elma? This is my opinion and it is how I feel about it stated Chairman Cirocco. Mr. Huber stated that I am listening to what you are saying. Mr. Huber stated I have worked the last 5-10 years specifically in that stretch so I can feel pretty accomplished by understating your quest but also acknowledging the Seneca Street area to me has always been a commercial district. Mr. Huber mentioned that I don't feel as if it is not in compliment with the old Elma Collision Building, which is the same height as the two buildings being proposed and the same type of structure. Mr Huber would like to have this area changed from the way you have seen it in the last 20 years. Mr. Huber feels that we need positive growth to continue to see progression for the next 20 years. Mr. Huber said I respect your opinion and I acutely listened to the way you are articulating your concerns as a resident, a builder and as a neighbor. Mr. Huber does not want to solicit or endorse anything which would be to the contrary as to where your sediments lie. I also think we need to recognize some needs and be more proactive in some thoughts that integrate with what you're saying with people who come to the table with financial resources to make it a better place. Chairman Cirocco stated that I appreciate your feedback and looking down Seneca street we are seeing a growing trend of pole barns going up. Chairman Cirocco said there is great work being done on Seneca Street as to where dilapidated buildings are transforming to beautiful buildings and there is a builder in town doing a beautiful job. Chairman Cirocco thinks it is detrimental to offset it with pole barns behind every building. Mr. Huber said I am spending a million dollars across the street and you need to recognize the importance of having momentum and then capitalize on it. Mr. Cirocco stated that one neighbor has put his house up for sale because he feels we are going to rubber stamping this and his property values will plummet. Mr. Huber stated this is the same neighbor that wants to sell Mr. Subjeck his property.

Mr. Baker mentioned that the solution is not two storage buildings shoehorned in a residence. Mr. Huber stated it is zoned commercial. Mr. Baker stated yes but next to it on both sides is a residence. Mr. Cirocco asked Mr. Wzykiwicz what is your take on the drainage plan. Mr. Wzykiwicz stated the minutes from December 20, 2016 EPB Meeting was my recommendation that a drainage district be formed and recorded along with the easement be shown allowing this. This easement would also be filed on Mrs. Zilliox's Deed for future purposes.

Mr. Reid stated that I agree with the concerns of both Chairman Cirocco and Mr. Baker, but this is like what we did on the corner of Conley and Seneca Street and were there any ill effects? This is a similar place down the street with a residence behind it.

Chairman Cirocco asked if any other EPB members had any other questions or concerns? There were no other EPB members that spoke now so Chairman Cirocco said we will review the checklist.

III. SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR (2) 2970 SQUARE FEET STORAGE BUILDINGS (CHANGE IN SIZE/LOCATION FOR 1 BUILDING) LOCATED AT 6411 SENECA STREET (cont.)

This is a Final Site Plan being proposed. The zoning is C-1. The Preliminary Business Use permit was tabled at the Town Board back in December of 2016. The EPB has three choices here, deny the site plan, give preliminary pending the return of a business use permit, or final site plan. Mr. Huber said every aspect was addressed for what was needed to return.

Chairman Cirocco made a motion to decline Site Plan Approval due to my concerns that the project it is not a good fit for the residents and the area /site is too small for the project. Mr. Baker seconded the motion. Before poll vote Mr. Reid asked is this project in compliance with the zoning code for district C-1? Mr. Balcerzak said it depends what you are using it for. Mr. Reid said let's assume it's for motor storage as per application. Mr. Balcerzak referenced §144-74 and the code is not specific but it states no outdoor storage and It does not say if it is or is not. Mr. Balcerzak and Phyllis Todoro both said it is compliant with Town Code. Mr. Waver stated it is a C-1 district but currently in today's code it would not work in a C-1 district due to it being too narrow, but this is grandfathered in. With the neighbor next door having his property for sale, if the applicant were to acquire this property, it would give them ingress and egress and that would alleviate my concerns stated Chairman Cirocco. Mr. Balcerzak stated that 144-78 C 1&2 that does it exceed the peek? Mr. Cirocco asked does it exceed 18' to the peek and Mr. Balcerzak said the sidewalls are 16' it is probably 24' or 25 to the peek. Mr. Cirocco stated we have a motion on the table and we need a poll vote.

Motion made by Chairman Cirocco to Decline Site Plan Approval due to concerns that the project is not a good fit for the residents and the area/site is too small for the project. Mr. Bakers seconded the motion. Yes-3 No-4 Motion Denied.

Motion failed, the EPB now will have a choice of preliminary site plan or final site plan. Chairman Cirocco will read the checklist and the EPB will determine action.

Applicant is seeking Final Site Plan Approval

- 1. Business Use Permit: No Business use permit*
- 2. SEQR: Yes*
- 3. Survey: Yes*
- 4. Site & Building Details: Applicant needed information regarding colors, siding and roofing details. Information on all details were provided.*
- 5. Lighting: Applicant was to provide details including manufactures specifications and wattage. Chairman Cirocco asked if lighting details are acceptable? EPB asked for manufactures specifications and wattage details which were not included.*
- 6. Parking: Are handicapped spaces marked?*
- 7. Letters had to be submitted from Erie County Health Department and Fire District.*
- 8. Forming of Drainage District: Still needs to be completed.*

Mr. Merkle stated that at this stage, I think we are probably in the Preliminary Site Plan approval process. Mr. Huber said that we have invested time and explored every detail, and Mr. Merkle commented stated that lighting details are not submitted. Chairman Cirocco stated the color, siding and roofing details have been provided. The manufactures specifications for the lighting details have not been provided as requested per the minutes from the EPB meeting in December 2016. The handicapped spots have been identified on the plans. Jim Wzykiewicz stated that forming of the

Town of Elma Planning Board Minutes (8/15/2017)
Page 9

drainage district is not required for Site Plan Approval but it will be noted to comply with minutes from EPB on December 20, 2016.

III. SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR (2) 2970 SQUARE FEET STORAGE BUILDINGS (CHANGE IN SIZE/LOCATION FOR 1 BUILDING) LOCATED AT 6411 SENECA STREET (cont.)

Letters from the Eire County health department and the Fire District have been provided. Chairman Cirocco stated the only item that is specifically missing is manufactures specification sheet on the lighting. Mr. Reid stated it is an 18 watt light bulb and it points straight down to the ground.

SEQR was reviewed and noted changes were made and initialed. Motion to grant SEQR approval was made by Chairman Cirocco and seconded by Mr. Reid. Yes-7 No- 0 Motion Carried.

Chairman Cirocco stated we have reviewed the checklist and SEQR. Chairman Cirocco explained that I will not make a motion because I am against the project, so if anyone would like to make a motion to approve Preliminary Site Plan or Final Site plan. Mr. Cleary made a motion for Preliminary Site Plan Approval. Chairman Cirocco asked do I have a second? Mr. Reid stated tabling of the Business Use is not requirement in the code to move forward, although it is on our checklist. Mr. Waver asked what are we asking them to return with? Chairman Cirocco stated they would return with the Preliminary Business Use Permit from the Elma Town Board and details for the lighting, A motion has been made for Preliminary Site Plan Approval so if you provide preliminary then they would have to come back presumably if the Town Board gives them a Business Use Permit and with the lighting specifications. If the EPB would grant Final Site Plan Approval and they receive a Preliminary Business Use Permit from the Elma Town Board then they meet the requirements of our checklist. If we do not give them Preliminary Site Plan it is up to the Town Board whether they want to approve the Business Use Permit or not.

Mr. Reid questioned the EPB what is the difference between Preliminary and Final Site Plan? With Final Site Plan Approval Chairman Cirocco stated that it is possible that the applicant could begin work tomorrow and begin to develop the site and although the applicant still will go to the Elma Town Board for the Preliminary Business Use permit. If the Elma Town Board did not grant the applicant Preliminary Business Use Permit and the applicant has started the project, then the responsibility is on the applicant for moving forward without the Preliminary Business Use Permit.

Chairman Cirocco stated we have a motion made on the table by Mr. Cleary for Preliminary Site Plan Approval and seconded by Mr. Baker contingent upon forming of a drainage district. The Elma Planning Board has made a motion to amended the contingencies to read Preliminary Site Plan Approval contingent upon forming of a drainage district and submittal for the specification for lighting and the definition of the dimension of the building. Mr. Huber stated that we did try to acquire a piece of property from the neighbor but we were unsuccessful. Mr. Reid inquired if we vote yes can we move for final approval he asked the Town Attorney, Phyllis Todoro. Phyllis Todoro stated yes you can move forward for Final Site Plan Approval. Yes-5 No-2 Motion Carried.

Chairman Cirocco asked if any other motions would like to be made?

Mr. Waver made a motion to grant Final Site Plan Approval contingent upon the forming of the drainage district as per our minutes from the December 20, 2016 EPB Meeting and seconded by Mr. Merkle. Yes-4 No-3 Motion Carried.

The applicant will have return to the Elma Town Board for a Preliminary Business Use Permit.

IV. SKETCH PLAN REVIEW FOR TWO APARTMENTS/COMMERCIAL BUILDING LOCATED AT 6272 SENECA STREET

Owner of property Todd Huber was present to speak of the project for Sketch Plan Review for Two Apartments/Commercial Building located at 6272 Seneca Street. This is a non-conforming lot referred to the ZBA. Mr. Huber stated the we acquired this property of the brown building and the white building in May. Mr. Huber went to the Town Board and put together a developmental plan that had shown the brown building with the change of the elevation to make the property more accessible like we changed the grade of the old firehall. Mr. Huber stated if you allow better parking, better accessibility and a nice building you will allow a better tenant. On June 14th Mr. Huber attended the Town Board Meeting and the Town supervisor wanted to know the timing of when the building was vacated and occupied. To which we supplied that there was a vagrant residing in the structure and was arrested. Mr. Huber authenticated that with a police report and Mr. Huber moved to start to renovate the brown building which has two apartments in it. In the process, Mr. Huber then paid for the water meters to be installed in the building and we were told that because we had exceeded the time table by 23 days (about two weeks ago). Mr. Huber had to go back to file the ZBA with the variances that would ensue for this brown building as well as any renovations we wanted to do with the white building. The structure had been vacant for over a year. Mr. Huber then had to go through the sketch review of what Mr. Huber wanted to do with the structure before Mr. Huber can move forward. The center columns on the brown building and another third of the building to the transit road side will be knocked down and take the two bedroom units presently and duplicate them on a different place on the site and bring it back to what it was. There would be parking on the west side of the business and there would be 12 parking spots for the proposed business. The EPB asked what kind of business would you like? Mr. Huber stated I would like a delicatessen or an ice cream shop. Right now, there is 5 apartments. Mr. Huber is going to do 2 apartments and one business in this structure and then there is two in the white building. At present there is now 7 total. Mr. Cirocco asked what do you plan to do with the rest of the property? Mr. Huber said I would like to build a double or a triple behind it at some time.

With sketch plan review the EPB will decide if this is suitable application to move forward. Mr. Cirocco stated you will need variances for 144-10 C and 144-11 B&C from the Zoning Board. Mr. Reid asked are you looking for a service type business? Mr. Huber stated yes. The zoning is C-1. The EPB agrees that the present plan would be a great improvement to the area.

V. ADJOURN

Motion to adjourn at 10:15 pm by unanimous consent.

Respectfully submitted,

*Brenda Barry
Elma Planning Board Secretary*