MINUTES

TOWN OF GORHAM PLANNING BOARD February 22, 2021

PRESENT: Chairman Harvey Mr. Farmer

Mrs. Rasmussen Mr. Dailey Mrs. Harris Mr. Kestler

Mr. Thomas-Alternate

EXCUSED: Mr. Hoover

Chairman Harvey called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM. Mr. Thomas-Alternate will be voting on all decisions tonight. Mrs. Rasmussen made a motion to approve the January 25, 2021, minutes as submitted. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Application #01-2021, Eric & Mary Wangler, owners of property at 3940 State Rt. 364, requests site plan approval to build a residential addition. Public Hearing time: 7:30PM to 7:50PM.

The public hearing was opened and the notice as it appeared in the official newspaper of the town was read.

On Thursday January 21, 2021, the Zoning Board of Appeals made the following motion: a motion was made to grant a 1.5% variance for 26.5% lot coverage and a 9.4'variance for a setback of 5.6' to the overhangs on the south.

 $\,$ Eric & Mary Wangler and Chuck Smith, Architect were present and presented the application to the board.

Mrs. Wangler stated that they bought this parcel 16 years ago. Her grandparents owned the cottage south of them and now her mom and siblings now share that cottage. Their cottage is a 1950's cottage and a little dated. They want to renovate it to open it up and expand it to maximize the lake views.

Mr. Wangler stated that they have sold their home in Rochester and are looking at this as their primary residence.

Mr. Smith stated that in order to expand the living space they are adding an addition on the street side. They are removing the 4 in 12 pitch of the home and putting on a second floor and steeper roof. They are replacing a deck on the street side with a patio.

They are going from about 1100 square feet to about 2400 square feet.

Mr. Smith stated that the existing garage and stairs coming down from the street they are not touching. They are building a new sidewalk from the existing garage to the front of the addition. They are building a patio on the lake side which also

has a planting bed in front of the patio. This will receive the runoff from the patio. They are making the basement accessible with an excavated area on the north west side of the basement, which is going to be positive drained to the hillside of the lake. The basketball court on the north side of the house is existing.

Chairman Harvey asked if they have submitted an Erosion Control Plan.

 $\,$ Mr. Smith stated that they have calculated the runoff from the patio. There is not an Erosion Control Plan.

Chairman Harvey stated that they will need to submit an Erosion Control Plan. The erosion control plan will need to show how you're diverting surface flow around the disturb areas. Where it is going to be captured and where the settling area is going to be before you discharge the stormwater.

Chairman Harvey asked what material is the proposed patio made out of.

Mr. Smith stated the patio is going to be either brick or a concrete paver. It will not be permeable.

Chairman Harvey stated they will need to show a design for the patio and engineering calculations showing the absorption area is going to handle the flow. They will also need to show a calculation showing the additional runoff from the downspouts on the addition. Where is the stormwater from those areas and from the additional hard surfaces being captured and being treated on the site? The contours on the plan need to be corrected to show at least 2% slope away from the foundation for a distance of at least 5 feet.

Mrs. Harris expressed a concern with the water flowing across the patio into the planting bed. Normally the water would go into a drain and then come out into the planter. The way it is shown it will come down and erode the edge where the water is spilling over. She also expressed her concern with only having 2 to 3 inches of soil for the vine to grow. A foot of soil would be better for the vine to grow. They may want to put an overflow in the planter and show where that is going to go.

Mr. Wangler questioned if the landscape planter was a requirement from the town.

Mrs. Harris stated that as part of the Town's Design Guidelines retaining walls and landscape help with the views from the lake.

Mr. Wangler questioned the Design Guidelines and how far from the lake does a landscape softening have to be placed.

This was discussed and he was told that there are many different options for plantings in the Design Guidelines.

Chairman Harvey asked what the finish floor elevation was for the basement.

Mr. Smith stated that the basement finish floor is 697.0. Chairman Harvey explained that they don't like to see direct drainpipes to the lake they would feel better if it went into a drywell with an overflow.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was any intent of changing the gravel area at the garage to some sort of pavement.

Mr. Smith stated that the gravel drive is counted as impervious in their calculations.

Mr. Farmer stated that the electric is coming in overhead to the southeast corner of the building and explained that he would like to see if they could put the electric underground.

 $\,$ Mr. Thomas asked if there was any outdoor lighting planned. Mrs. Wangler stated that they plan on an outdoor light on the house.

Mr. Wangler stated that they will have one on the garage to see the steps.

Mr. Smith stated that there are light fixtures on both sides of the door facing the street and wall mounted light fixtures on both sides of the patio doors on the patio side. They are listed as dark sky compliant.

Chairman Harvey asked if there were any comments from the public. Hearing none, the public hearing was closed.

A letter dated February 2, 2021, was received from New York Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation on this application, stating that there is no impact on archaeological and/or historic resources listed in or eligible for the New York State and National Registers of Historic Places.

The Planning Board discussed and completed Part 2 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form. The board determined this to be an unlisted action under SEQR that will not receive coordinated review since no other discretionary agency approval is required.

Mrs. Rasmussen made a motion to approve the Short Environmental Assessment Form, part 1 amending 12a as NO and 12b as YES and part 2 as completed by the Chairman making a "negative determination of significance" stating that the proposed action will not result in any significant, adverse, negative environmental impacts as the board did not find a single potentially large impact related to this project. Mr. Kestler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Farmer made a motion to approve the site plan with the following conditions: 1. Modify the site plan showing positive drainage away from the foundation. 2. Submit calculations on the stormwater showing that they have accommodated the additional lot coverage. 3. Modify the design of the planting

beds to ensure the vegetation is going to survive. 4. Show an overflow on the planting beds. 5. Show a drywell with an overflow on the drain at the basement entry instead of a direct discharge to the lake. 5. Bury the electric unless there is some practical hardship and show on the plan. 6. Have an Engineer stamp the final drawings. 7. Provide an Erosion Control Plan. Mrs. Harris seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Application #02-2021, Michael & Anne Shea, owners of property at 4626 Lake Drive, requests site plan approval to build a single family home. Public Hearing time: 7:55PM to 8:15PM.

The public hearing was opened and the notice as it appeared in the official newspaper of the town was read.

On Thursday January 21, 2021, the Zoning Board of Appeals made the following motion: a motion was made to grant a variance of 3.77% for a lot coverage of 28.77%.

Michael & Anne Shea and Chuck Smith, Architect were present and presented their application to the board.

Mrs. Shea stated that they have owned this property for 11 years and are looking to build a year around home.

Mr. Smith stated that the existing home did not meet the setback requirements and with the new home they have moved it to comply with all the setback requirements. The home is raised up a little to get it out of the flood plain, but it meets the height requirement. There is a porch on the west side of the house that is opened underneath so that they can store kayaks and such.

Chairman Harvey asked if they have provided a calculation that they haven't filled or obstructed the flood plain.

Mr. Smith that the proposed home will be on a crawl space that will have flood gates in the crawl space. There is very little grading change on the site.

Mr. Smith stated that they didn't get a stamp from a licensed Professional Engineer for the drainage calculations and will get that done on the final site plan.

Chairman Harvey asked if there were any comments from the public. Hearing none, the public hearing was closed.

Chairman Harvey stated that there needs to be an Erosion Control Plan. One of the requirements for the disturbed area they have to intercept the upland flow and divert it around the disturbed area. This has to be stabilized before the rest of the site is opened up.

A letter dated February 1, 2021, was received from New York Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation on this application, stating that there is no impact on archaeological

and/or historic resources listed in or eligible for the New York State and National Registers of Historic Places.

The Planning Board discussed and completed Part 2 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form. The board determined this to be an unlisted action under SEQR that will not receive coordinated review since no other discretionary agency approval is required.

Mrs. Rasmussen made a motion to approve the Short Environmental Assessment Form, part 1 as completed by the applicant and part 2 as completed by the Chairman making a "negative determination of significance" stating that the proposed action will not result in any significant, adverse, negative environmental impacts as the board did not find a single potentially large impact related to this project. Mr. Dailey seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Dailey made a motion to approve the site plan and grant a flood plain permit pursuant to Chapter 45 Flood Damage Prevention with the following conditions: 1. The site plan will document that there will be no additional fill in the flood plain. The portions of the structure below flood elevation will incorporate the flow through requirements in the building codes. 2. Add a Professional Engineer stamp to the drainage calculations 3. Add Erosion Control measures to the site plan diverting the uphill flow around the disturbed area. Kestler seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

MISCELLANOUS:

Mr. Dailey made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:43PM. Mrs. Harris seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Thomas P. Harvey, Chairman

Sue Yarger, Secretary