

Village of Webster
Planning Board Meeting Minutes

Meeting Minutes of April 3, 2014

Community Meeting Hall
29 South Avenue
Webster, NY 14580

Present:

Chairman Peter Adams, Peter Bowers, Chris Krawiec, Judy Gurnett, Attorney David Mayer, Building/Code Enforcement Officer Will Barham, Secretary Carol Moranz

Absent: Kathy Bills

The meeting came to order at 7:30 pm.

Motion was made by Peter Bowers, seconded by Chris Krawiec to accept the minutes from the March 6, 2014 meeting. All in favor, none opposed, motion passes.

1. Robert Bringley, P.E. of Marathon Engineering representing Greg Chambery, owner of parcel on Barrett Drive, Tax ID #080.09-1-9.121. Applicant seeking subdivision and preliminary/final site plan approval. Property Zoned: West End Business.
Mr. Bringley presented request for site plan and subdivision approval of 3.1 acres on Barrett Drive. One 9,000 square foot northern building – it fits the current zoning; no variances will be requested for this project. It will have 54 parking spaces. The second building will be a 14,000 square foot building with 84 parking spaces. There will be shared parking/ access with the gym property to the south of this project. The project will incorporate sidewalks and a crosswalk for pedestrians. Applicant noted they will tie into the existing storm, water, sanitary sewers and electric infrastructures. The north building will be constructed first. The pad for the second building will be poured; however that building will be constructed at a later time. Project will use Village-style coach lights and the dumpsters will be enclosed. The two buildings will line up with each other. LeFrois will be the builders of the project.
P. Adams stated the Board would like to see the traffic study. Applicant had made the changes that had been requested so it is coming along. J. Gurnett wanted confirmation that the stop sign was added to the southwest corner. Applicant stated it was added. The trees will be kept along the Post Office side and will be supplemented with other ornamental and foundation trees. It was also noted that a monument sign would be applied for at a later date if requested by the University of Rochester. P. Adams said that we can have another informal meeting before the May meeting. Applicant asked if the fire marshal could also be included in that meeting.

Open to the Public

David Kumor– 169 Champion Ave. – discussed a possible bridge over the creek from the apartment complex. P. Adams noted the liability issue on private property and also that it is in a flood zone. C. Krawiec stated that there is also an existing sanitary sewer easement on the property, so typically it is frowned upon to build things on top of existing easements.

Bob Steinorth – 25 Dunning Ave. – there seems to be a lot of curb cuts along Barrett Drive that are not in alignment. Bob Bringley stated that there is a driveway access from the gym owner's property. We located driveway access to split the property which forces people to stop and not to just drive right across Barrett Drive. The traffic study will address this issue.

Dave Ernst – Webster Columbus Center – we would really like to see this facility there. We would be willing to discuss moving our curb cut if needed.

Closed to the Public

P. Adams said that applicant is requesting to table any decisions tonight. Items for next meeting will be: subdivision, site plan, SEQR, and the waiver for parking. Applicant stated they will be requesting a waiver for 9' x 18' parking spaces.

2. Todd R. Stuve, P.E. of Exxel Engineering, Inc. representing Midwest XX, LLC developer for 77 East Main Street (old Burger King). Tax ID # 080.10-3-6. Application for site plan approval and demolition of existing 3,000 S.F. (+/-) building, and build single story 9,287 S.F. building to be used as a "Dollar General". Applicant seeks four (4) deferred parking spaces and a variance for size of new parking spaces (Village Code requires 10' x 20'; applicant seeks 9' x 19'). Applicable Zoning Code: 175-20; 175-33(g), 175-3 (definitions: Parking Space). Property Zoned: Central Business.

P. Adams said that this is strictly a conceptual meeting. There will be no motion made on anything regarding this tonight.

Applicant representative T. Stuve stated that everything would be removed from the existing site, building, paving, and lighting, in preparation for the project. He presented a plan for a 9,300 square foot Dollar General store which will be 71' wide and 131' deep with 30 parking spaces along the west side of the site. We would be seeking a waiver for 9' x 19' spaces. The entrance to the store will be on the corner with sidewalk access along the parking side of the property. Service will be on the southwest side of the building Dumpsters will be located in the corner of the property and will be enclosed and screened. The building will have mounted lighting. Applicant would like to add 3 more pole lights for more lighting on the west side of the property. It will have a peaked roof, a brick facade, glass windows with awnings, high quality metal roof and air conditioning units on the east side with the screened fence. They are proposing a monument sign and a sign on the north face of the building. The signs will be internally lit which is standard for Dollar General.

P. Adams stated that this type of business is allowed in this commercially zoned area. He noted that page 87 of the Village Comprehensive Plan states what we would like to see in this area. Any building on this site would need to conform to our design standards for this commercial character area. One of our standards is a pitched roof and the building needs to have a center entrance. My opinion is that it is a little too big for the area and needs to fit in more with the surrounding buildings. I do not see it as a workable design for this area.

C. Krawiec – this rendering does not show the building properly. Doors are in the wrong places. This is an architect's opportunity to create a building that fits into the area. You will be hard pressed to get a steel structure building with a brick façade through without much difficulty. Applicant does have some examples of other Dollar Generals. We can change overhangs and some other ideas that we can share with you. Greg Olsen stated that they have done other stores in municipalities like ours and we have a product that we have to conform to what the tenant requires. For example, Manchester Michigan requested a sloped roof. We can adapt, we can change. Applicant described the building material. It is considered a "green" product.

P. Adams said that part of the challenge is putting a 9,300 s.f. building and bringing in a semi-truck into the property and unloading into a residential area. Applicant stated that that delivery occurs during the business hours but is adapted into communities as corporate sees fit. It comes in once a week, it is not parking there. We are here because the site will support our needs. They discussed items that Dollar General carries. Paper products, perishable items, cleaners, small automotive items, cleaning items, cosmetics, and personal care items are many of the items carried.

Opened to the Public

George Casolari – 112 Dunning Ave. – Wouldn't this be better along the 104 corridor?

Patti Cataldi – 33 Dunning Ave. - Pg 30 of the Comprehensive Plan lists types of businesses desirable to this area. Page 45 lists the unique characteristics of the area. Page 57 discusses the vision and goals – mixed uses, small town feel. I don't see how this fits. It does not have the transitional characteristics needed for the area. A 6 foot monument sign would be horrific. I don't think Dollar General is a good fit for the Village.

Betsy Murray – 31 Clover Dr. – Does not feel that Dollar General represents what Webster is about. This property should be geared toward small, locally owned businesses.

Jim Rockcliff – 58 E. Main St. Harmony House – Parking is our primary concern. We are concerned there won't be enough parking.

Karl Lauer – Webster Historic Commission – We don't agree with a Dollar General on Main St. We would be willing to work with the Planning Board on the design elements.

Jake Swingly – 121 E. Main St. – This is not reasonably compatible with the neighborhood. Just because we can do something doesn't mean it is right to do it.

Debbie Casolari – 121 Dunning Ave. – We don't want semi-trucks and delivery trucks in the Village.

Bob Steinorth – 25 Dunning Ave. – This is a transitional area into the Village. This is way out of character for the area.

Mike Gustin – 81 E. Main St. – We put money into our building to make it fit into the area. This project does not fit. It is not fair to the businesses around it.

Damian Kumor – 179 Champion Ave. – I don't necessarily mind a Dollar General there but I think this design is lazy. This plan has no design to it, it is very plain. Other chains make the effort to fit into the areas, Dollar General does not. The sign is just atrocious; it is designed to be obnoxious. If that is the corporate requirement it will never be allowed.

Dick Cataldi – 33 Dunning Ave. – looking at the Manchester site, it does not look like it is a residential area. It does not fit into the area.

Kyle Swingly – 121 E. Main St. – there are not going to be enough parking spaces.

Darrell Byerts – 36 Elm St. – a 6' fence will not block a solid wall from my home. I would certainly rather something other than a Dollar General go in.

Rick Walter – 20 Elm St. – a 6' fence doesn't block light from shining into my yard. There will be extra traffic up until 10:00 pm at night which will disturb the neighbors.

Patti Cataldi – 33 Dunning Ave. – We take tremendous pride in our Village neighborhood. It is important to keep that in mind.

Closed to the Public

P. Adams – gentlemen it is obvious what the public is telling you. I don't see a 9,300 s.f. building ever being able, design wise, to fit into this area. It is definitely too big. There is enough in the Code to say that It is not a good fit for the Village. A Dollar General is more suited for strip malls and plazas. Not on a Main Street in a Village.

P. Bowers – can't add anything to perfection to what has already been said.

J. Gurnett – I agree

C. Krawiec – I am a proponent of commercial development. This will be an incredibly hard sell and a hard fit into the Village. However, no one is beating down our door to develop this property. We will be stuck with an eyesore until something more appropriate is proposed. I understand what everybody feels. It is an allowed business. We hear the public. Maybe this isn't the right fit for this site.

P. Adams – we spoke of Dollar General Standards. We don't answer to corporate standards. We are here to hear proposals. I would say that the building is too big as it stands now for the lot, it doesn't transition well from the residential area into the commercial area. It is going to be a challenge. You are welcome to meet with us informally to discuss this. I will leave it up to you going forward.

3. Draft response from Planning Board to Village Board regarding North Avenue Project. P. Adams said that the only change is on page 2, the WCCED CAP study. Recommendation was for on street parking in front of the townhouses on North Ave. It will add more of a Village feel.

C. Krawiec asked if this will be parallel parking. P. Adams said it is going to narrow the lanes or push the sidewalks back.

J. Gurnett – are there mature trees that would have to be cut down? P. Adams said that is a good question. We will have to see the design; we don't know what it is going to look like. This is going to go to the Village Board as a recommendation. It was noted that it could be used by visitors to the townhouses and the bike trail.

D. Mayer – this is just a request for recommendations from this Board to the Village Board.

P. Adams – do we want to include it in the draft recommendation? We can move it to an addendum, not in the recommendations. We are adding it in under other considerations, not under recommendations.

The Board discussed the possibility of changing the meetings start time to 7:00 pm. It was noted, however, that the Village offices are open until 7 so that will not work. P. Adams nixed the idea.

Motion was made by Chris Krawiec seconded by Judy Gurnett to close the meeting at 9:29 pm. All in favor none opposed, motion passes.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol A. Moranz
Planning Board Secretary