

**PUBLIC HEARING AND
REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HELD OCTOBER 02, 2007**

Present: Michael Chase, Chairman

Vincent DelGatto, Jr.
Judy Robinson

Absent: Gary Bogner, Daniel Cianfoni

Others attending: Diane Reed Allen, Richard Cirulli, Sharry Cirulli, Randy Bebout, Kathleen Vienna, Debbie Frederick, Joe Pullen, Pat Nicoletta, Frank Gorgonzola, Carol Gorgonzola, John Barry, Josh Allen, Frank Corino, Laurent Gurewitch, Anthony DelGatto, Don Eastman, Trish Barry, Matt Schaertl, Steve DeHond.

Recording: Rita J. Gurewitch, Clerk/Treasurer

Chairman Michael Chase re-opened the Public Hearing at 7:00 pm and stated that this hearing is a continuation of the September 04, 2007 Public Hearing for Paddocks of the Finger Lakes. A proposed apartment complex on State Street. Chairman Chase also stated that previous comments have been recorded and if anyone had any new comments or have not spoken previously to address the board. Chairman Chase then called upon Mr. Cirulli.

Mr. Cirulli: He feels that he has been limited in speaking since he cannot bring up anything that the board is already aware of. Mr. Cirulli stated that he assumes the ruling is for both sides. If the taxpayers are going to be limited, the contractors and everybody else is going to abide by the same rules.

Chairman Chase: He repeated that what was said last month is on record, and the purpose is to gather new comments.

Mr. Cirulli: Wonders why the meeting is taking place if nothing new is coming out.

Ms. Robinson: There are new people present to express their concerns and Mr. Cirulli's are already on record.

Ms. Frederick: Asked questions about items she doesn't understand. She was referring to State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) Full Environmental Assessment Form. Her question was concerning the answer to #16, Lakes, ponds, wetland areas within or contiguous to project area answered *NONE EXISTING, DETENTION POND PROPOSED 0.35 Acres*.

Mr. Pullen: Ms. Frederick doesn't have the current SEQR. A new one was submitted this evening. It now states 4.11 acres wetlands, and a proposed retention pond of 0.35 acres.

Mr. Cirulli: There are problems here. The proposal came in with nine buildings, then went to seven. When this project went before the zoning board Mr. Cirulli questions if it is actually legal to have it changed and questions if it should go back to the zoning board with the current plan.

Chairman Chase: When it was nine buildings the variance request was for the recreation land to be omitted. When the plan changed to seven buildings due to the wetlands becoming larger, that was when the area variance was requested to reduce the setback from the allowed 75 ft to 50 ft. That was the second variance requested.

Mr. Cirulli: He stressed that there were nine buildings for both variances.

Ms. Frederick: She questions #17 on the SEQR that asks if the site is served by existing public utilities and states yes.

Mr. Pullen: There are public utilities present (in the village) to hook up to.

Ms. Frederick: She questioned the no answer to *Will the proposed action affect aesthetic resources?* She asked what that meant.

Mr. Pullen: It won't have an aesthetic impact.

Ms. Frederick: So, putting up all these vinyl buildings around like a trailer park thing, that will be two stories, and how many feet high, isn't going to change the aesthetics?

Mr. Pullen: There is no impact.

Ms. Frederick: There is no impact on traffic?

Mr. Cirulli: It says there is no impact on traffic?

Mr. Nicoletta: MRB has previously asked for clarification from Mr. Pullen.

Ms. Frederick: She would like to know the difference between an EIS form and an EAF form.

Mr. Nicoletta: The first step in the SEQR process is an EAF form (Environmental Assessment Form). It was requested they do a long EAF form and depending on how the board acts tonight, will determine whether an EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) They will look for any significant environmental issues that would trigger an environmental impact statement.

Ms. Frederick: Regarding the sewage, we have over capacity already, with sewage water going into the outlet.

Mr. Nicoletta: As discussed at the previous hearing the sewer treatment plant is adequate for this project.

Mr. Cirulli did not agree with this statement displaying letter previously sent by village concerning inflow and infiltration.

Chairman Chase informed Mr. Cirulli if he was going to be unruly he would be asked to leave.

Chairman Chase: Stated that the plant operator himself said that this project can handle the increase caused by Paddocks of the Finger Lakes.

Ms. Frederick: Stated she spoke with the DEC (Dept. of Environmental Conservation) and also has sent them information concerning this project. She's concerned since there is already raw sewage going into the outlet, during rainy season and plus the impact of this development because the land is only 23% absorbent. She doesn't know about the coverage of black top wondering where is in the EAF form. She is concerned about the run-off. She continued speaking about water and that the waste treatment plant was over 25 years old. These are concerns that she has, along with the pond. She asked how far the buildings are going to be from the pond.

Mr. Pullen: He would have to measure that for her.

Mr. Cirulli: Question what is truthful and what is untruthful regarding the sewer treatment plant. From the letter the village sent him and the public and what is stated by the sewer treatment plant operator. He wants to know which one is telling the truth and which one wasn't.

Chairman Chase: As a planning board member I'm going by what Mr. Romeiser said at the last meeting. I realize that a letter was sent for the residents of the west end of State Street to try to discover if there were any sump pumps draining into the sewer which was infiltration that needs to be corrected.

Mr. Cirulli explained his views on that sump pumps would not cause the kind of infiltration that the village describes in its letter. It says that 3 out of the last 4 months have been over capacity. The letter stresses the mention of over capacity and possible fines. He wants answers. Yes, this is true, No, it isn't true or let's correct the situation.

Chairman Chase: It was discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Romeiser and Mr. Liberati both stated that the village works on infiltration and inflow over time so that what we pay for water and sewer wouldn't triple if they did the fixes all at once. So they break it up over time. He also mentioned that he was working with the DEC with these issues so they don't just come down on us each time.

Mr. Cirulli: State Street has been told for over 10 years that the problem was there. Mr. Cirulli resents the statement that the sewer treatment plant has the capacity, when it doesn't have the capacity according to their information. Mr. Cirulli wants the facts sent to the State so that they see there is a discrepancy between the village board themselves and their employees and maybe even their engineer who says its not over capacity.

Mr. Nicoletta (MRB rep): That was based on the conversation with the plant operator at the last meeting.

Mr. Cirulli: Questions if that is the case, how does he base which one is fact and which one isn't? The letter from the village board or the sewer treatment plant.

Mr. Nicoletta: Stated he has not seen the letter Mr. Cirulli is referring to. He is basing his findings on a discussion with the plant operator who runs the plant.

Mr. Cirulli: He wants people to take the time to go down to the sewer treatment plant and review the records that are there, three out of the last four months they ran over everyday, just about. There is a problem. Many people might want this project to go through, and he feels it wouldn't be bad if it was in the right place, but when it's on an

over taxed system, he feels it's wrong. Something has to be done to correct it instead of making it worse.

Chairman Chase: Stated they have to go by what the plant operator told them, Mr. Romeiser stated that it can be done.

Mr. Cirulli: As long as his comments are being put on record, and shows that the operator and the village are stating two different stories, it's fine with him.

Ms. Frederick: Regarding the water again on the SEQ. Is it currently no that it won't affect any water.

Mr. Pullen: Yes.

Ms. Frederick: So the cleaning of the pond water that will drain back in the...

Mr. Pullen: The storm water will run into the pond and will purify...

Ms. Frederick: So, that shouldn't be a yes since something is going to change here.

Mr. Pullen: Not that is significant.

Ms. Frederick: Will the proposed action affect surface or groundwater quality or quantity? It says yes. She stated that's all for now.

Mr. Corino: His comments are almost the same as last time. The other concern that his has is the trees or bushes that will be put in. He will wait and see what kind of affect that will do. How far from the road and how far from his house.

Mr. Pullen: Stated he can show Mr. Corino on the plans later.

Mr. Gurewitch: His concern was that a lot of people were asking questions and might not be as well prepared as they might be, without up to date information that causes delays. He appreciates all the questions and they are proposed well, but the interest of making meetings efficient and congenial maybe it might behoove the board before the meeting to comment on the up to date information.

Anthony DelGatto: He stated he is a resident of Merrick Avenue. His concern is that any amount of construction will cause increase traffic. Not just on Merrick Avenue and State Street, but throughout the whole community. It has been a long time since RIG moved in and every time a truck goes by there are always branches laying in my yard. It's not just RIG, but all tractor trailers. There are a lot of young kids moving in and the village should direct its attention on what route these trucks should go. There use to be weight limit signs and they are no longer around.

Mr. Pullen: State Street is posted.

Mr. DelGatto: He has surveyed the village. State Street use to be Route 96 at one time. That's the shortcut and everyone goes there. Now, there is excessive speed and he thinks its up to the village board, it might not be appropriate for the planning board, but they need to step up and get someone, whether full time or part time police. The individual we have does a good job, but when you need him during the day there isn't anyone around. Mr. DelGatto went on discussing the police issue. Mr. DelGatto is 100% in favor of having the apartments as long as the village has all the utilities that can supply it, and that all of the codes are met. Some would say he is influenced because he knows the people involved, but he has been in construction for over 30 years, and his feeling is that if the village can develop something and have it to village code, and be able to supply it, he doesn't see why the village shouldn't do it. Eventually, whether we want it or don't want it, it's going to come here.

Ms. Robinson: Stated she attended the village board meeting last evening and that truck tonnage was discussed and that weights could be changed. Delivery trucks being exempt. Traffic was discussed on State Street they agreed to have that area patrolled more frequently.

Mr. Cirulli: The woman at last nights meeting was concerned about traffic on State Street now, and this project is only going to add a lot more.

Ms. Frederick: To respond to Mr. DelGatto. If this project was up to code, it would be smaller. It was given variances to get to where it is.

Mr. Schaertl: He attends as many meeting as he can, being involved with the town (councilman), lives in Shortsville, being in the Chamber of Commerce, he tries to keep abreast of everything that goes on. After hearing about the complaints of speeding on State Street, he told those present they don't have to go to the village to get it rectified. By calling the Ontario County Sheriff they will get a faster response. He proceeded to give examples. He also agrees, that if someone proposes a project, and it meets codes, he's all for it. He is against subjective creativity and artistic reliance of what someone thinks what something should look like or what's pretty and what's not pretty.

Chairman Chase: Ask if anyone else would like to speak before closing the public hearing.

The public hearing was closed upon motion at 7:42 pm. Chairman Chase thanked everyone for attending and being involved with the community.

REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING OCTOBER 02, 2007

Present: Michael Chase, Chairman
Vincent DelGatto, Jr.
Judy Robinson

Absent: Gary Bogner, Daniel Cianfoni

Others attending: Diane Reed Allen, Richard Cirulli, Sharry Cirulli, Randy Bebout(McDonalds), Kathleen Vienna, Debbie Frederick, Joe Pullen, Pat Nicoletta, Frank Gorgonzola, Carol Gorgonzola, John Barry, Josh Allen, Frank Corino, Laurent Gurewitch, Anthony DelGatto, Don Eastman, Trish Barry, Matt Schaertl, Steve DeHond, Terry Lattimore (RGE), John Bitter, Robert Featherstone, Kenneth Litfin.

Recording: Rita J. Gurewitch, Deputy Clerk/Treasurer

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Chase at 7:45 pm.

MCDONALD'S RESTAURANT – ROUTE 96

FRA, 530 Summit Point Dr, Henrietta NY, submitted an application for site plan approval for McDonald's USA, LLC, Pittsburgh, PA to construct (2) drive-thru booths totaling 95 sq ft and modify the current kitchen and beverage equipment at the current McDonald's located 4126 NY Route 96. There will be no change in use, no change in height or stories, and the addition will be 95 sq ft.

Chairman Chase informed Mr. Randy Bebout, FRA representative, that due to McDonald's location on State Route 96, these plans were submitted to Ontario County Planning Department for their review and comments. That meeting will take place on October 10, 2007.

Mr. Randy Bebout, from FRA, is present on behalf of McDonald's USA. McDonald's is requesting site plan approval for some modifications to the current site. They are making slight changes to their restaurants across the country. Mr. Bebout went on to explain McDonald's proposal. It will basically look as it does today, with the two bump outs for the drive-thru and will match the existing architecture. It will not affect utilities and the drainage will swale as it does today.

Mr. Nicoletta advised the board that MRB doesn't see any additional impacts of what is there now, the pavement to the west is minimal, bump outs are minimal. Mr. Nicoletta did question the landscape plans. Mr. Bebout stated due to the overhang they didn't know what would grow there, or if just stones. He will find out that information.

Chairman Chase asked Code Enforcement Officer Steve DeHond, if he had any questions, Mr. DeHond asked if the entrance and exits were have any changes at all and Mr. Bebout said no.

A Short Environmental Assessment Form was submitted. The board proceeded in reviewing the SEQR. Ms. Robinson asked if this project is going to take place on land that is already cleared and already lawned. Mr. Bebout stated that is correct.

After completing Part II of the EAF, Ms. Robinson introduced the following NEGATIVE DECLARATION resolution, seconded by Mr. DelGatto who moved its adoption:

WHEREAS: In accordance with Section 8-0113 Article 8 of the New York Environmental Conservation Law, the Planning Board of the Village of Manchester has conducted an initial review to determine whether the McDonald's project may have a significant affect on the environment, and;

WHEREAS: The Planning Board has compared the application and plans submitted with the criteria set forth in Part 617.7 of the Regulations, and;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE RESOLVED, The Planning Board of the Village of Manchester, as lead agency, has determined on the basis of that review that (1) The proposed project constitutes an “Unlisted Action” since it has not been classified as a Type 1 Action or a Type II, and (2) that the proposed action described will not have a significant environmental impact and an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared.

The above resolution was put to roll call vote, which resulted in the following:

Michael Chase	Voting	“AYE”
Judy Robinson	Voting	“AYE”
Vincent DelGatto	Voting	“AYE”

The resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

Vincent DelGatto then made a motion to give McDonald’s USA, LLC, preliminary site plan approval contingent upon Ontario County Planning Board comments, seconded by Michael Chase and put to roll call vote as follows:

Michael Chase	Voting	“AYE”
Judy Robinson	Voting	“AYE”
Vincent DelGatto	Voting	“AYE”

The motion was carried.

ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC

Rochester Gas & Electric Company has submitted an application for site plan approval and a special use permit to expand their existing substation located on the south side of State Street at the west village boundary. The existing station is on approximately 1.2 acres and the proposed expansion will add .84 acres. The land used is in the Village of Manchester and the Town of Farmington.

Mr. Ken Litfin, of Hatch Acres Corp., consultant to RG&E, addressed the board and introduced the others with him. Mr. Terry Lattimore, RG&E, John Bitter, RG&E, and Bob Featherstone, Hatch Acres Corp.

Mr. Lattimore spoke that the idea to expand started about 1 ½ years ago with dialogue with the Town of Farmington. Mr. Lattimore explained that the frequencies of outages not only affects homeowners, but has a detrimental impact on sanitary pumping stations. It created problems for the Towns of Farmington, Victor and Manchester.

Town of Farmington Supervisor, Ted Kaminski requested RG&E explain the situation. RG&E met with the Town of Farmington Board with Village of Manchester Mayor, Nancy Johnsen attending that meeting, along with Leslie Baymen, Town Supervisor for Victor.

RG&E presented a plan that would eliminate the frequencies of the outages by expanding the power transmission substation operation. Mr. Lattimore stated that Ontario County shows growth and development and in order for RG&E to maintain the level of reliability for the region they need to expand the substation. They would create two additional lines, where if one goes off, the other picks it up, resulting in no loss of power. Mr. Lattimore stated that it is a crucial project and needs to be done.

Mr. Litfin explained that yesterday they appeared before the Town of Farmington Zoning Board and he showed the board the boundary line showing that the property is almost cut in half between the Town of Farmington and the Village of Manchester. They must get approval with each municipality. In the approval process a zoning variance was needed with the Town of Farmington for a control house on premises which was granted.

They are requesting preliminary site plan approval tonight from the village and tomorrow night preliminary site plan approval from the Town of Farmington planning board.

A letter was sent to Code Enforcement Officer Mr. Floyd Kofahl, Town of Farmington, from Mayor Johnsen, that the village is currently negotiating with RG&E for the use (or acquisition) of necessary land required for this proposed expansion.

Mr. Litfin then explained the proposed expansion to the board. He stated that they had previously walked the area with the village engineer and the DPW supervisor regarding some of the village’s concerns with drainage. They will work with the adjacent

property owner Old Castle, along with the village engineer, and the DPW to work out a drainage easement to aid in any drainage issues. The village engineer indicated they needed a grading plan, drainage plan, and an erosion sedimentation control plan, which will be included in the final site plan submission.

The proposed control house building as shown on the plans is located on village property in the Town of Farmington. As stated, a letter was sent to the Town of Farmington indicating that it is the village's intent to let RGE purchase or use the property for the building, with those negotiations currently in process. RGE received a variance from the Town of Farmington Zoning Board of Appeals on 10/1/07; they will go before the Town of Farmington Planning Board on 10/3/07. They are scheduled for review by the Ontario County Planning Board on 10/10/07.

A meeting is to be scheduled with Old Castle East, RGE, and the Village of Manchester, to decipher the details in either land acquisition and/or easement requests.

Patrick Nicoletta stated that a major concern would be that the drainage easement or access be continued for the village. The fifteen foot setback is not adequate enough for drainage improvements or structure, which is why a meeting with Old Castle will discuss an easement on their portion of property to allow more space.

A question arose if this project needed a special use permit. After a discussion with the Code Enforcement Officer, Steve DeHond, it was determined that RGE did not need a special use permit.

Mr. Litfin informed the board that the Town of Farmington will be the lead agency on the SEQR form. The Village of Manchester Planning Board will need to review that form and make comments. A motion was made by Vincent DelGatto seconded by Judy Robinson to acknowledge the Town of Farmington Planning Board as lead agency. Voted on and unanimously carried.

These plans will be reviewed by the Ontario County Planning Board, the Town of Farmington Planning Board and the Village of Manchester Planning Board.

It was determined that additional information and meeting outcomes need to be gathered in order to continue with the process of preliminary and/or site plan approval.

ROCHESTER INSULATED GLASS

MRB Group, village engineers and Costich Engineers, representing Rochester Insulated Glass have continued to address items on the submitted site plans to meet with approval.

As stated in the minutes of September 4, 2007, the SEQR process and public hearings for this project were completed by the Ontario County Industrial Development Agency, as RIG is seeking funds from that agency. A Public Hearing was held on April 20, 2007 and was published in the Canandaigua Daily Messenger. It was determined that the IDA is the lead agency on this project and the Manchester Planning Board acknowledges the IDA as Lead Agency. A Full Environmental Assessment Form was completed and it was determined that the project will not result in any large and important impact(s) and, therefore, is one which will not have a significant impact on the environment, therefore a negative declaration was prepared. Signed by Michael J. Manikowski, CEO/IDA as responsible officer in Lead Agency and signed by Thomas Harvey, OCPD as preparer. Dated May 31, 2007. Resolution was attached to the September 04, 2007 minutes.

CEO Steve DeHond explained the water line with the hydrants needed. Engineer Pat Nicoletta stated that a letter of credit was requested for the waterline in case the waterline is not completed.

After a discussion with village engineer, a motion was made by Chairman Chase to grant final site plan approval to Rochester Insulated Glass, contingent upon complying with the Dept of Health and posting the letter of credit for the water line, seconded by Vincent DelGatto, and put to a roll call vote as follows: Michael Chase "AYE", Vincent DelGatto "AYE", Judy Robinson "AYE", voted and unanimously carried.

PADDOCKS OF THE FINGER LAKES

Chairman Chase requested from Mr. Pullen the written response of the MRB comments of September 27, 2007. There was no written response. Mr. Pullen proceeded to state that most of the comments are minor in nature. Mostly notes of clarification. Mr. Pullen referred to Item 9. to verify fire flow requirements based on ISO standards. ISO

regulates fire insurance premiums. It has been calculated at less than 300 gallons/minute. They may not meet the standard of 750 gallons/minute. Many small communities cannot meet these standards due to the age of the lines. Mr. Pullen stated that the measurement would require the developer to pay a little more in fire insurance. Chairman Chase asked if the standards could be met, Mr. Pullen stated they could not, but they do meet the minimum required by the NYS Health Dept. The village line is estimated at 650 gallons/minute, with their project use, they will have a little of 500 gallons/minute. Mr. Pullen then explained the reports that he submitted.

Mr. Pullen presented their traffic study. He affirmed that State Street use to be a state highway and has more than enough capacity for their project and more future growth. If people are breaking the law by speeding and reckless driving, the burden shouldn't be placed on the developer, but increase law enforcement. He requested to be exempt from a full traffic study. The board then asked the village engineer to explain a full traffic study.

Ms. Robinson stated that she feels there are two issues presently. One is the speeding traffic, which is no fault of the developers, and her feeling is that there is enough concern regarding the traffic, that she is a proponent to have a traffic study done.

Mr. Barry addressed the board and agrees there is concern about the traffic. He feels that they should not be responsible for the traffic study and if a problem is there, he feels the village should address it not them. Mr. Barry states that the development will not have a significant impact on State Street. The main concerns he has heard are major truck use, speeding, reckless driving, issues he feels are village matters.

Ms. Robinson proceeded to give her estimation on traffic congestion. That it is difficult to make assumptions on traffic flow. She feels her request for a traffic survey is that it seems that is what the people want.

Mr. Cirulli stated that according to the Inspector General's Office the village should be the one to do it. He feels it will rely on the people who would complain regarding the safety of the children on that street.

Mr. Barry explained their position of safety also. The impact of this project is not going to contribute significantly to the traffic problems that already exist.

Mr. Cirulli felt that is disputable.

Mr. Barry continued to say that the Planning Board is not the board to appeal the traffic hazards to, but he would be an advocate to approach the village board on this matter. Not just State Street, but other streets as well. He feels a traffic study is not going to fix or remedy any of these concerns, but only burden them financially. They think they should help the community by going to the village board and stating this is an issue that should be looked at.

Chairman Chase compared putting commercial retail outlet there, say a Wegmans, and that of the apartments, as to traffic and asked the village engineer. Mr. Nicoletta stated that this type of development and its location would not normally expect a traffic study.

A discussion continued on traffic.

Mr. Pullen stated they are looking for final approval conditioned on the health dept. approval and addressing the water main.

Ms. Robinson stated she had more questions. She stated sidewalks need to be added to the plans, especially entering.

Mr. Barry said they will be on the plans, but he wanted to clarify before changing the plans where to put them.

A discussion proceeded on sidewalks. Clarification with the Dept of Public Works as to where the sidewalk should go will be needed. In the proposed agreement with the village board a walkway will be directed toward the family park to encourage walking that way.

Ms. Robinson stated that according to Mr. Barry, the stormwater management pond shows a dry pond. Mr. Pullen stated it is not suppose to be a dry pond. Clarification was given that water will be present to allow treatment. Ms. Robinson asked where the out fall into the wetland is. Clarification was made that there is no actual culvert discharge pipe. Mr. Pullen & Mr. Nicoletta will bring about the details of the pond.

Mr. Cirulli strongly voiced his concerns about water drainage. He referred to the proposed RG&E expansion on the west end of State Street that may add to additional water problems. Mr. Nicoletta stated there will not be additional water added to the wetlands. It will be controlled. Mr. Cirulli asked how the water will be controlled at the

lift station that will have to travel east. Chairman Chase stated that is not part of this project. The village board would have to address that issue.

Mr. Cirulli strongly feels that the added water is going to accentuate the villages existing inflow and infiltration difficulties.

A discussion proceeded regarding surface water versus sanitary sewer discharge.

Ms. Robinson explained surface water flow and storm water management ponds.

Ms. Robinson asked if any protection will be surrounding the water retention pond. Mr. Pullen answered that the DEC is not an advocate to fencing because if someone crosses the fence, you then can't get at them. The pond will be designed to DEC regulations.

A discussion followed as to concerns of toxicity of the water gathering due to the roundhouse being nearby.

Chairman Chase asked village engineer Mr. Nicoletta if he had anything to add. Mr. Nicoletta mentioned that water main will need to be dedicated to the village then he will add comments. He cannot see anything more for the SEQR requirements. Mr. Pullen addressed MRB's comments and the board proceeded with the SEQR review. It was determined that the items requested on the SEQR were answered accordingly.

After completing Part II of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF), Chairman Chase introduced the following NEGATIVE DECLARATION resolution, seconded by Ms. Robinson who moved its adoption:

WHEREAS: In accordance with Section 8-0113 Article 8 of the New York Environmental Conservation Law, the Planning Board of the Village of Manchester has conducted an initial review to determine whether the Paddocks of the Finger Lakes project may have a significant affect on the environment, and;

WHEREAS: The Planning Board has compared the application and plans submitted with the criteria set forth in Part 617.7 of the Regulations, and;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, The Planning Board of the Village of Manchester, as lead agency, has determined on the basis of that review that (1) The proposed project constitutes an "Unlisted Action" since it has not been classified as a Type 1 Action or a Type II, and (2) that the proposed action described will not have a significant environmental impact and an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared.

The above resolution was put to roll call vote, which resulted in the following:

Michael Chase	Voting	"AYE"
Judy Robinson	Voting	"AYE"
Vincent DelGatto	Voting	"AYE"

The resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

An entailed discussion followed the SEQR review.

Chairman Chase made a motion to give Paddocks of the Finger Lakes preliminary site plan approval, seconded by Vincent DelGatto and put to roll call vote as follows:

Michael Chase	Voting	"AYE"
Judy Robinson	Voting	"NAY"
Vincent DelGatto	Voting	"AYE"

The motion was carried.

Chairman Chase made a motion for final site plan approval for Paddocks of the Finger Lakes, contingent on MRB comments of September 27, 2007, excluding SEQR EAF section which has been completed, (see attached), the sidewalks will be added and location determined by the Dept of Public Works, seconded by Vincent DelGatto and put to roll call vote as follows:

Michael Chase	Voting	"AYE"
Judy Robinson	Abstained	
Vincent DelGatto	Voting	"AYE"

The motion was carried.

Mr. DeGatto addressed fellow board members and requested to have the planning board approach the village board to work with the concerns on State Street regarding drainage and sewer inflow and infiltration, along with an explanation of the letter sent to residents. He would like the village board to look into the run off at the end of State Street to see if it is plugged at some point. Also, traffic issues with possible more policing.

Meeting was closed upon motion at 10:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Rita J. Gurewitch