

Minutes of the Town of Sennett Special Town Board meeting held on Wednesday March 3, 2021.

Members Present: Thomas Gray, Supervisor
Edward Rizzo, Town Councilman
Richard Gagliardi, Town Councilman
Michael Adrian, Town Councilman
Also present: Richard Andino, Town Attorney
Thomas Blair, Esq.
Matt Napierala, PE

The meeting is opened with the pledge to the flag. Supervisor Gray states that the meeting will be in two segments – First the SEQR review for the Sennett Meadows PDD and the second a workshop on the WD#1 and WD#3 project with the Town Engineer.

Attorney Andino states that the board will review Parts 2 and 3 of the SEQR this evening. The Town Board made itself the lead agent regarding the SEQR at the December 2020 meeting. The project was declared a Type 1 action. This is a zone change from residential to a PDD, it is an existing 32± acre parcel, the purpose is to allow construction of a sixty-unit senior independent living apartment facility on a 10.0-acre lot within the 32-acre zone change parcel. Attorney Andino begins the review. Part 2 – Page 1 – Identification of Potential Project Impacts #1 Impact on Land? Yes. Attorney Andino reads each question – all will have no, or small impact may occur. Attorney Andino asks if there are any concerns with the answers or questions. Councilman Adrian asks if there is a timeline for the project. Matt Napierala responds that it will be seven to nine months once they start – less than a year. #2 Impacts on Geological Features? – No impact. All questions are reviewed. Does the board agree or have any questions? None. #3 Impacts on Surface Water? Yes. Because it is a new project with construction of the 60-unit structure. Attorney Andino reads the relevant questions regarding this and all are answered with no, or small impact. Does the board have any concerns or questions regarding this question? None. #4 Impact on Groundwater? Yes. Similar to question 3 because this a new construction with buildings and parking lots. Attorney Andino reads the relevant sub questions, and all are answered nom or small impact. Attorney Andino asks the board if they have any concerns or questions regarding this question? None. #5 Impact on Flooding? No. Attorney Andino questions the board if they have any questions or concerns with this question? None. #6 Impacts on Air? No. Attorney Andino questions the board if they have any questions or concerns with this question? None. #7 Impacts on Plants or Animals? No. Attorney Andino questions the board if they have any questions or concerns with this question? None. #8 Impacts on Agricultural Resources? Yes, there is an agricultural district. Attorney Andino reads the

relevant sub questions, and all are answered no. or small impact. Attorney Andino questions the board if they have any questions or concerns with this question? None. #9 Impact on Aesthetic Resources? No. Attorney Andino questions the board if they have any questions or concerns with this question? None. #10 Impact on Historical and Archeological Resources? No. Attorney Andino questions the board if they have any questions or concerns with this question? None. #11 Impact on Open Space and recreation? No. Attorney Andino questions the board if they have any questions or concerns with this question? None #12 Impact on Critical Environmental Areas? No. Attorney Andino questions the board if they have any questions or concerns with this question? None. #13 Impact on Transportation? No. Attorney Andino questions the board if they have any questions or concerns with this question? None. #14 Impact on Energy? Yes. Attorney Andino reads all the relevant sub questions, and all are answered no, or small impact. Attorney Andino asks the board if they have any questions or concerns with this question? None. #15 Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light? Yes. Attorney Andino reads all the relevant sub questions, and all are answered no, or small impact. Attorney Andino asks the board if they have any questions or concerns with this question? None. #16 Impact on Human Health? No. Attorney Andino questions the board if they have any questions or concerns with this question? None. #17 Consistency with Community Plans? Yes. Attorney Andino reads all the relevant sub questions, and all are answered no, or small impact. Attorney Andino asks the board if they have any questions or concerns with this question? None. #18 Consistency With Community Character? No. Attorney Andino questions the board if they have any questions or concerns with this question? None. Attorney Andino asks the board if they have any questions on Part 2 that they just reviewed? None. Next is Part 3 – This is where the Board, using the findings in Part 2, that they make their determination. Attorney Andino reviews the following:

SEQRA EAF Part 3 Attachment
Evaluation of the Magnitude and Importance of Impacts
Town of Sennett - March 3, 2021

The proposed “Action” concerns the development plans of Rochester's Cornerstone Group, Ltd. (“Applicant”) consisting of an approximate 56,810± square foot senior apartment complex building to be constructed on a 10 acre parcel located at 3365 East Genesee Street Road together with a private internal driveway system and parking areas, drainage and wastewater holding and/or transportation facilities, associated site lighting, water supply and sanitary facilities, and such other infrastructure as is customary of a senior apartment complex containing approximately 60 apartment units, a management office, community spaces, common areas, and open spaces (the “Action”).

The following is a discussion of the potential environmental impacts of the Action as identified in the Part 2 EAF. **Small to moderate impacts** were identified in the areas of Impact on Land, Impact on Surface Water, Impact on Groundwater, Impact on Agricultural Resources, Impact on Energy, Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light and Consistency with Community Plans. Based upon the discussion that follows, none of these impact categories were determined to be important for the reasons discussed herein, and/or were deemed to be properly mitigated.

IMPACT ON LAND – *The proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of, the land surface of the proposed site. (See Part 1. D.1)*

Proposed Action concerns a 10.0± acre Planned Development District (“PDD”) parcel to be subdivided from Tax Map No. 116.00-1-6.814, with an estimated 4.0± acre area of disturbance.

The proposed Action concerns a property which maintains prior development approvals for a 4 building, 32-unit apartment complex together with internal driveways, parking lots, drainage, water, sewerage, lighting and other such facilities relating to the approved apartment complex development. The previously approved apartment complex plans received a “negative declaration” under SEQRA on or about May 1, 2014. This Action proposes to develop and construct a one-building senior apartment complex and related facilities upon the same lot and with essentially the same amount of site disturbance and introduction of impermeable surfaces. The PDD parcel upon which the Action would occur is vacant land with mostly scrub growth upon it, and contains no Critical Environmental or Impact areas, special geological features, or protected fauna, flora, or animal species or habitat. There are high power electrical distribution lines and easements abutting the land and the site has only limited development potential due to the high voltage wires and infrastructure, together with a watercourse which runs in a north to south direction.

f. *Additional runoff is anticipated from roof, driveway, parking, and pedestrian sidewalk areas.*

The Action will create additional “runoff” water from anticipated roofs, driveways, parking areas and pedestrian sidewalks areas. However, these “runoff” waters will be collected and directed to stormwater quality mitigation basins and to water quality mitigation basins. The basins will discharge along the natural runoff patterns at rates less than occurs in existing conditions. Runoff waters will eventually discharge to an unnamed wetland area west of the PDD parcel. All development activity will remain at least 400 feet from the watercourse and wetland features on or adjacent to the PDD parcel. Stormwater mitigation measures are to be approved by NYDEC and will ensure

drainage methods and operations will not adversely impact water flow or quality, and instead will improve upon the current drainage of the site. The Action will utilize sanitary sewer infrastructure, to be extended on site and thus will not significantly impact groundwater or the water table. Approved stormwater retention basins will collect and release water at controlled flow levels so as to avoid adversely impacting current drainage patterns or conditions. There are no steep slopes on site, nor is there karst topography or bedrock outcroppings. All development activity will be monitored and controlled by the Town of Sennett and NYSDEC. Anti-erosion and sediment control mechanisms will be utilized during all phases of construction. It is determined that there are no specially recognized land-use concerns with development or construction on the proposed site, and in fact, it is well-suited for the location of a development project such as is proposed. Thus, for the above-stated reasons, it is deemed the proposed Action will have **no or only a small impact.**

2. IMPACT ON GEOLOGICAL FEATURES – *The proposed action may result in the modification or destruction of, or inhibit access to, any unique or unusual land forms on the site (e.g. cliffs, dunes, minerals, fossils, caves.). (See Part 1. E.2.g.)*

The proposed project site does not contain nor is it adjacent to any unique geologic features or National Landmarks and therefore there will be no impact from the proposal.

3. IMPACT ON SURFACE WATER - *The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies (e.g. streams, rivers, ponds or lakes). (See Part 1 D.2, E.2.h)*

Proposed Action concerns a 10.0± acre Planned Development District (“PDD”) parcel to be subdivided from Tax Map No. 116.00-1-6.814, with an estimated 4.0± acre area of disturbance including drainageways and retention ponds that will introduce treated and controlled waters into one or more waterbodies and/or wetlands.

The proposed Action concerns a property which maintains previous development approvals for a 4 building, 32-unit apartment complex together with internal driveways, parking lots, drainage, water, sewerage, lighting and other such facilities relating to the approved apartment complex development. The existing approved apartment complex plans received a “negative declaration” under SEQRA on or about May 1, 2014. This Action proposes to develop and construct a one-building senior apartment complex and related facilities upon the same lot and with essentially the same amount of site disturbance and introduction of impermeable surfaces. The Action

contemplates the use of stormwater and sediment control facilities and mechanisms which are extremely similar in scope, scale, and operation as compared to the existing apartment complex design approvals.

d. The proposed action may involve construction with or adjoining a freshwater or tidal wetland, or in the bed or banks of any other water body.

It is determined that the proposed stormwater management system consisting of a water quality basin in the form of a bioretention area and a water quantity basin in the form of a detention basin, will have little to no impact on the existing surface waters on or near the property. Stormwater runoff from the proposed development will be treated and peak rates reduced such that surface water quality and runoff rates will not be impacted downstream of the stormwater management system. The building and parking areas for the project will not impact any jurisdictional wetland areas. The proposed action will require utility service connections from sanitary sewer and natural gas to cross a wetland system west of the subject site. NYDEC Wetland Mapping has been included as part of the application materials and as part of the Town Engineers' review. Coordination is underway with NYDEC and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers with regards to potential impacts of the utility crossing. This crossing will be accomplished either with directional drilling of the utilities or a minor temporary disturbance that will be mitigated upon the completion of the utility installation. NYS state approved sediment control mechanisms will be utilized and monitored at all times during construction.

f. The proposed Action will include the construction and installation of one or more intake(s) for withdrawal of water from surface water.

It is determined this will not have a significant impact on the environment. The proposed Action will create an increase in water demand in Town of Sennett Water District No. 6 by 5,400± gallons per day, which is a *de minimus* increase in comparison to current water usage within the district. The proposed project will involve running a water service line from the existing Town water main along East Genesee Street Road to the proposed building.

g. The proposed Action may also include one or more outfall(s) for the discharge of wastewater to surface waters.

It is estimated that up to 5,400± gallons per day will be discharged upon completion of full buildout of the senior apartment building. These outfalls will be conveyed to the City of Auburn Water Pollution Control Facility via domestic sanitary sewer system in the Town of Sennett Sewer District #1. The conveyance of the above-described wastewater constitutes only a *de minimus* increase in wastewater flows in Sennett Sewer District #1.

h. The proposed Action may cause some soil erosion, or otherwise create a source of stormwater discharge that may lead to siltation or other degradation of water bodies.

It is determined, due to Town of Sennett and NYDEC approved stormwater and sediment control mandates, neither the stripping of vegetation and soils nor the introduction of an estimated 1.9± acres of new impervious surfaces is expected to significantly adversely impact nearby waterbodies or watercourses. In fact, controlled flows, water treatment, and mitigation measures are estimated to improve nearby surface water predictability and quality. The potential for siltation and sedimentation of nearby waterbodies and watercourses will be adequately controlled and managed via measures designed and installed as per the requirements set forth in the latest edition (2016) of the New York Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control, and in compliance with the Protection of Waters permit and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") that the proposed project will be subject to.

i. The proposed action may affect the water quality of any water bodies within or downstream of the site of the proposed action.

It is determined that the proposed stormwater management system consisting of a water quality basin in the form of a bioretention area and a water quantity basin in the form of a detention basin, will have little to no impact on the existing surface waters on or near the property. Stormwater runoff from the proposed development will be treated and peak rates reduced such that surface water quality and runoff rates will not be impacted downstream of the stormwater management system. In fact, controlled flows, water treatment, and mitigation measures are estimated to improve nearby surface water predictability and quality. The potential for siltation and sedimentation of nearby waterbodies and watercourses will be adequately controlled and managed via measures designed and installed as per the requirements set forth in the latest edition (2016) of the New York Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control, and in compliance with the Protection of Waters permit and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP") that the proposed project will be subject to. The PDD parcel is not located within a designated watershed area or near a municipal aquifer.

Thus, for the above-stated reasons, it is deemed the proposed Action will have **no or only a small impact.**

4. IMPACT ON GROUNDWATER – The proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquifer. (See Part 1.D.2.a, D.2.c, D.2.d, D.2.p, D.2.q, D.2.t)

Proposed Action concerns a 10.0± acre Planned Development District (“PDD”) parcel to be subdivided from Tax Map No. 116.00-1-6.814, with an estimated 4.0± acre area of disturbance including drainageways and retention ponds.

The proposed action concerns a property which maintains current valid development approvals for a 4 building, 32-unit apartment complex together with internal driveways, parking lots, drainage, water, sewerage, lighting and other such facilities relating to the approved apartment complex development. The previously approved apartment complex plans received a “negative declaration” under SEQRA on or about May 1, 2014. This Action proposes to develop and construct a one-building senior apartment complex and related facilities upon the same lot and with essentially the same amount of site disturbance and introduction of impermeable surfaces. The Action contemplates the use of stormwater and sediment control facilities and mechanisms which are extremely similar in scope, scale, and operation as compared to the existing apartment complex design approvals.

h. Other impacts: Connect to an existing utility.

It is determined that the proposed Action may result in new or additional uses of ground water or may have the potential to introduce contaminants into ground water, however, due to the stormwater and sediment control measures and factors mentioned in #3 above, and detailed in the Applicant’s site development plans, the Action is not estimated to have any significant adverse impacts to existing groundwater sources. In fact, with the proposed stormwater management system the detention basin will provide additional groundwater recharge opportunities thus increasing and improving groundwater supplies. While the proposed project will connect to an existing municipal water main running along East Genesee Street Road, this connection is not estimated to have an adverse impact on groundwater resources or quality. The PDD parcel is not located within a designated watershed area or near a municipal aquifer. Thus, for the above-stated reasons, it is deemed the proposed Action will have **no or only a small impact.**

5. IMPACTS ON FLOODING – *The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding. (See Part 1. E.2).*

The applicant has prepared and submitted a SWPPP for the proposed project and will implemented stormwater management controls consistent with local and State requirements. The project is not located within any wetland area or wetland buffer area. As stated by the DEC in a letter dated December 20, 2020, the parcel on which the project will be constructed is not located within or near any NYS freshwater wetlands.

6. IMPACTS ON AIR – *The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source. (See Part 1. D.2.f., D.2.h, D.2.g).*

No state regulated air emissions are proposed as part of the project. (See EAF Workbook).

7. IMPACTS ON PLANTS AND ANIMALS – *The proposed action may result in a loss of flora or fauna. (See Part 1. E.2. m.-q).*

There are no identified endangered species, flora or fauna located at the project site nor are there any habitats of concern. See DEC letter dated December 28, 2020 (“We have determined that the site is not located within or near records of any state-listed species...”).

8. IMPACT ON AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES – *The proposed action may impact agricultural resources. (See Part 1.E.3.a and b.)*

Proposed Action concerns a 10.0± acre Planned Development District (“PDD”) parcel to be subdivided from Tax Map No. 116.00-1-6.814, which is located one property away from the adjacent Cayuga County Agricultural District No. 5.

The proposed Action concerns a property which maintains current valid development approvals for a 4 building, 32-unit apartment complex together with internal driveways, parking lots, drainage, water, sewerage, lighting and other such facilities relating to the approved apartment complex development. The previously approved apartment complex plans received a “negative declaration” under SEQRA on or about May 1, 2014. This Action proposes to develop and construct a one-building senior apartment complex and related facilities upon the same lot and with essentially the same amount of site disturbance and introduction of impermeable surfaces. The Action contemplates the use of stormwater and sediment control facilities and mechanisms which are extremely similar in scope, scale, and operation as compared to the existing apartment complex design approvals. The Action differs in no material way from the previous 4-building apartment complex approvals in relation to possible impacts on the nearby agricultural district.

h. Other impacts: Within an Agricultural District.

The PDD parcel is not situated directly next to the existing Cayuga County Agricultural District No. 5, however, it is a property away from it. Thick scrub and underbrush features on lands to be owned and maintained by the Applicant to the north serve to buffer the Agricultural District land from the PDD parcel. The Applicant’s development plans do not seek to remove or irretrievably convert any agriculturally used lands to non-agricultural uses. The Applicant is aware that the Town of Sennett is a farm-friendly Town and will utilize best practices

during development and construction phases to ensure nearby farming activities are not adversely affected. There are natural vegetative buffers located between the proposed PDD parcel and improvements to be constructed, thus, farmlands in the vicinity will not be directly impacted by construction activities or future senior apartment complex operations. Thus, for the above-stated reasons, it is deemed the proposed Action will have **no or only a small impact**.

9. IMPACT ON AESTHETIC RESOURCES - *The land use of the proposed action are obviously different from, or are in sharp contrast to, current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resources. (See Part 1. E.1.a, E.1.b, E.3.h.)*

There is no obvious change or sharp contrast to the existing land uses in the area (See EAF Workbook). The applicant is maintaining a large buffer area to the west of the project site. In addition, the applicant conducted a drone visual impact analysis demonstrating minimal aesthetic impacts to surrounding properties. In addition, the proposed building is architecturally consistent with the surrounding area.

10. IMPACT ON HISTORIC OR ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES - *The proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource. (See Part 1. E.3.e, f. and g.)*

The proposed project site does not contain nor is it contiguous to any buildings, archaeological site or district which is listed on the National Register. A "no impact" letter was received by the Town from SHPO dated December 15, 2020 ("We have reviewed the revised site plan and continue to recommend that no historic properties, including archeological and/or historic resources, will be affected by this undertaking.").

11. IMPACT ON OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION - *The proposed action may result in a loss of recreational opportunities or a reduction of an open space resource as designated in any adopted municipal open space plan. (See Part 1. C.3.c, E.1.c., E.2.q.)*

The Town does not have an adopted municipal open space plan and there are no identified open space or recreational resources that will be lost as a result of the project.

12. IMPACT ON CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL AREAS - *The proposed action may be located within or adjacent to a critical environmental; area (CEA). (See Part 1. E.3.d)*

There are no critical environmental areas located on or adjacent to the project site.

13. IMPACT ON TRANSPORTATION – *The proposed action may result in a change to existing transportation systems. (See Part 1.D.2.j)*

Proposed Action concerns a 10.0± acre Planned Development District (“PDD”) parcel to be subdivided from Tax Map No. 116.00-1-6.814, with a 56,810± square foot two-story building to be constructed upon it, together with parking facilities sufficient for 60 senior apartment units and staff members working in the building.

The proposed Action concerns a property which maintains prior development approvals for a 4 building, 32-unit apartment complex together with internal driveways, parking lots, draining, water, sewerage, lighting, and other such facilities relating to the approved apartment complex development. The previously approved apartment complex plans received a “negative declaration” under SEQRA on or about May 1, 2014. The currently approved apartment building development, with 32 apartment units with 2 and 3 bedroom units would conceivably accommodate an average of at least 2 vehicles per apartment unit, totaling at least 64 automobiles on site. For the previously approved apartment complex, the majority, if not all of the proposed tenants would be joining the work force on a daily basis, thus contributing to the morning and evening peak commute into and out of the apartment complex and traveling on East Genesee Street Road (NYS Route 20) each day.

This Action proposes to develop and construct a one-building senior apartment complex and related facilities upon the same lot. It is well known and accepted that senior living facility residents do not all own or operate motor vehicles. The Applicant suggests that half, or less, of all residents at their other existing senior apartment complexes actually drive. Thus, the proposed project will have fewer automobiles on site than the already approved apartment complex. The proposed senior apartment complex will have minimal impact upon the morning and evening peak commute times, as the majority of the senior citizen tenants are expected to not be joining the workforce on a daily basis and also tend to avoid the busier traffic hours. East Genesee Street Road (NYS Route 20) is under the jurisdiction of the New York State Department of Transportation (“NYSDOT”). The Applicant has presented to NYSDOT a Phase One application for right of access/curb cut from the PDD parcel onto the highway. Upon review of sight distance, highway capacity, project trip generation, accident data, general highway safety, etc....NYSDOT has approved the proposed driveway access under its Phase One review process. A Traffic Summary Memo prepared by Napierala Consulting dated October 1, 2020 indicates that the location of the proposed driveway has over 1,000 feet of site distance looking in

both directions and the project will generate 11 vehicle trips during the peak weekday morning hours, and 15 vehicle trips during peak weekday afternoon hours. The vehicle trips generated are less than 1% of the existing daily traffic along this section of East Genesee Street Road. The Applicant has provided data from the NYSDOT database and Cayuga County Sheriff's office. This data discloses that previous accidents along East Genesee Street Road in the vicinity of the proposed project were related only to adverse weather conditions (snow and ice) or vehicles being operated at unsafe speeds. No rear-end or turning movement accidents were recorded in the vicinity of the proposed project site.

Thus, the proposed Action will have less of a traffic impact than the already approved Action on the same site.

a. Projected traffic increase may exceed capacity of existing road network.

The proposed project will have driveway access onto East Genesee Street Road, or New York State Route 20, via a 24-foot wide commercial driveway. New York State's Department of Transportation has issued a preliminary design approval for the proposed "curb cut" and has not indicated any concerns during consultations concerning the designs provided by Applicant's site Engineer. New York State Route 20 was initially designed and developed using New York State "turnpike" standards which anticipate substantial traffic loads. Current peak weekday traffic trips between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. as detailed in Napierala Consulting's October 1, 2020 Traffic Summary Memo, are approximately 1150, while evening peak hour trips between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. total approximately 1,200 on weekdays. These "peak" trip totals are not necessarily consistent, and traffic levels are typically much lower during non-peak hours and also on weekends. Trip generation estimates for the proposed 60 apartment unit senior project calculate that there will be an introduction of 11 additional vehicle trips during weekday morning peak hours and 15 additional vehicle trips during weekday evening peak hours. The project vehicle trips into or out of the developed project site constitute less than 1% of existing traffic along this section of NYS Route 20, thus, it is determined that the proposed project should have only a minimal impact upon the existing roadway network.

e. The proposed action may alter the pattern of movement of people or goods.

The proposed project will have driveway access onto East Genesee Street Road, or New York State Route 20, via a 24-foot wide commercial driveway. New York State's Department of Transportation has issued a preliminary design approval for the proposed "curb cut" and has not indicated any concerns during consultations concerning the designs provided by Applicant's site Engineer. New York State Route 20 was initially designed and developed using New York State "turnpike" standards which anticipate substantial traffic loads. Current peak weekday traffic trips between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. as detailed in Napierala Consulting's October 1, 2020 Traffic Summary Memo, are

approximately 1150, while evening peak hour trips between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. total approximately 1,200 on weekdays. These “peak” trip totals are not necessarily consistent, and traffic levels are typically much lower during non-peak hours and also on weekends. Trip generation estimates for the proposed 60 apartment unit senior project calculate that there will be an introduction of 11 additional vehicle trips during weekday morning peak hours and 15 additional vehicle trips during weekday evening peak hours. The project vehicle trips into or out of the developed project site constitute less than 1% of existing traffic along this section of NYS Route 20, thus, it is determined that the proposed project should have only a minimal impact upon the pattern of movement of people or goods

Thus, for the above-stated reasons, it is deemed the proposed Action will cause have **no to very minor changes to existing transportation systems.**

14. IMPACT ON ENERGY – The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy. (See Part 1.D.2.k)

Proposed Action concerns a 10.0± acre Planned Development District (“PDD”) parcel to be subdivided from Tax Map No. 116.00-1-6.814, with a 56,810± square foot two-story building to be constructed upon it, together with parking, utility and lighting infrastructure typical to senior apartment projects of the proposed scope and scale.

The proposed Action concerns a property which maintains current valid development approvals for a 4 building, 32-unit apartment complex together with internal driveways, parking lots, drainage, water, sewerage, lighting and other such facilities relating to the approved apartment complex development. The previously approved apartment complex plans received a “negative declaration” under SEQRA on or about May 1, 2014. This Action proposes to develop and construct a one-building senior apartment complex and related facilities upon the same lot and with a similar energy load consumption.

e. Other impacts: Proposed project demand now and future.

It is not estimated that the increase in electricity needs of up to 540 ± megawatts annually will be significant to the local grid, or existing infrastructure in the neighborhood. There will be no need for the modification or expansion of existing substations and the proposed project has received a utility “will serve” acknowledgement from NYSEG indicating adequate electric and gas capacity exists. High efficiency appliances including Energy Star certified units will be utilized in all apartments and common areas. LED lighting will be utilized in all common areas, including exterior lighting installations. This will be a LEED certified apartment complex (under LEED for Homes Version 4 Program) that also complies with NYSERDA’s New Construction-Housing (NC-H) Program.

Thus, for the above-stated reasons, it is deemed the proposed Action will have **no or only a small impact.**

15. IMPACT ON NOISE, ODOR, AND LIGHT – The proposed action may result in an increase in noise, odors, or outdoor lighting. (See Part 1.D.2.m., n., and o)

Proposed Action concerns a 10.0± acre Planned Development District (“PDD”) parcel to be subdivided from Tax Map No. 116.00-1-6.814, which will maintain natural vegetative barriers from the building and site lighting to the west, north and east upon the PDD parcel, and also upon adjacent lands owned by the Applicant which are abutting on the west and north sides of the PDD parcel.

The proposed Action concerns a property which maintains prior development approvals for a 4 building, 32-unit apartment complex together with internal driveways, parking lots, drainage, water, sewerage, lighting and other such facilities relating to the approved apartment complex development. The existing approved apartment complex plans received a “negative declaration” under SEQRA on or about May 1, 2014. This Action proposes to develop and construct a one-building senior apartment complex and related facilities upon the same lot and with nearly identical noise, odor and lighting concerns.

d. The proposed action may result in light shining onto adjoining properties.

It is determined that routine odors emanating from the PDD parcel during the construction phase and later the operation of the 60-unit senior apartment complex may be produced for more than an hour a day. However, the odors will be very temporary and short-lived in nature, and the use of building ventilation and exhaust systems will not concentrate and release potential odors in such a manner that the odors will become noxious, or out of the ordinary for the NYS Route 20 corridor, or the nearby residential neighborhood which has seen ongoing construction projects occur within it for over two decades. It is determined that the operation of vehicles in and out of the senior apartment complex could conceivably cause some light infiltration upon adjoining properties, however, a photometric study conducted reveals 0.0 footcandles of light at all property lines. The existence of site vegetation on or surrounding the proposed senior apartment building will invariably screen most, if not all vehicle head lights. Further there are not abutting residential properties directly to the east, south, or north of the proposed building that would be of concern. Residences to the west are expected to be screened from project light intrusion by the afore-mentioned vegetative buffers between the proposed Action and Quincy Hill Drive. It is also determined that the proposed on-building lighting, and directional “dark sky” pole LED lighting proposed for parking lot areas are not likely to cause light spillage onto adjoining properties. Though pole heights are noted to be 20-feet in height, the downcast LED lighting will illuminate in a

downward direction and will be night sky compliant. Any building “wallpacks” or other on building lighting will be designed to shine downward in such a manner so as not to spill onto adjoining properties.

Thus, for the above-stated reasons, it is deemed the proposed Action will have **no or only a small impact**.

16. IMPACT ON HUMAN HEALTH - *The proposed action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants.* (See Part 1.D.2.q., E.1. d. f. g. and h.).

The project site is not on, adjacent to or near a contaminated site and does not use, create, dispose of or store hazardous substances or other sources of contaminants. (See EAF Workbook).

17. CONSISTENCY WITH COMMUNITY PLANS - *The proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans.* (See Part 1. C.1, C.2. and C.3.).

Proposed Action concerns a 10.0± acre Planned Development District (“PDD”) parcel to be subdivided from Tax Map No. 116.00-1-6.814 to allow for the construction of a 56,810± square foot senior apartment complex building together with a private internal driveway system and parking areas, drainage and wastewater holding and/or transportation facilities, site lighting, water supply and sanitary facilities, and such other infrastructure as is customary of a senior apartment complex containing approximately 60 apartment units, a management office, community spaces, common areas, and open spaces (the “Action”).

The project requires the instant application for a zone change of the subject parcel to a Planned Development District. However, the existing zoning already allows for residential development in the area but limits the number of units for multi-family housing. Development proposals for the property include a recent approval for a 4 building, 32-unit apartment complex. The instant proposal seeks to construct a single 60-unit apartment building. The comprehensive plan provides goals for diverse housing options and housing for seniors and therefore the project is largely consistent with the comprehensive plan and residential zoning and character for the area.

18. CONSISTENCY WITH COMMUNITY CHARACTER– *The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character.* (See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3).

The proposed zone change to PDD to allow for a senior residential apartment development is consistent with the character of the area and consistent with

the goals of the comprehensive plan. As noted above, among other things, the project poses no aesthetic impacts, no historic resources will be impaired, no critical environmental areas are affected and no open space or recreational opportunities will be diminished.

Attorney Andino questions Matt Napierala about the location of the Ag District. He responds that it is in the Ag District, but there is no active farming on the premises and that there is a vegetative buffer to the north. Attorney Andino asks the board if they have concerns or changes to any of the questions that he has further reviewed? None.

TOWN OF SENNETT SEQRA RESOLUTION
REGARDING ROCHESTER'S CORNERSTONE GROUP'S PROPOSED
SENNETT MEADOWS SENIOR APARTMENT PROJECT
March 3, 2021

WHEREAS, on December 17, 2020, in accordance with the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"), the Town of Sennett Town Board ("Town Board") announced its intent to serve as lead agency with respect to applications submitted on behalf of Rochester's Cornerstone Group, Ltd. ("Applicant") to develop and construct a 60 unit senior affordable 55+ or 62+ apartment facility, together with related improvements as are fully detailed within the application materials and environmental record (the "Project") to be located on a 10 ± acre parcel of land (the "Parcel") to be subdivided from land commonly known as 3365 East Genesee Street Road and having a Tax ID. No. 116.00-1-6.814 (the "Property") which Parcel is to be zoned Planned Development District ("PDD"); and

WHEREAS, the Town Board has determined that the Project is a Type I action as defined under SEQRA and its implementing regulations 6 NYCRR Part 617 (collectively "the SEQRA Regulations"); and

WHEREAS, on or about December 18, 2020, the Town Board notified all potentially involved and interested agencies of its intention to act as lead agency for the Project's environmental review and circulated the Project's Full Environmental Assessment Form ("FEAF"), Part 1 together with relevant Project application materials; and

WHEREAS, no other agency asserted legal authority or jurisdiction to serve as lead agency for the Project and the Town Board is the lead agency for purposes of conducting environmental review under SEQRA; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board convened and continued properly noticed and held public hearings in the Town of Sennett municipal building located at 6931 Cherry

Street Road, Town of Sennett, New York, on January 21 and February 18, 2021, during which public hearing(s) the Town Board elicited input and evidence from members of the public, the Applicant, and other involved or interested parties on the Project's development and construction plans, site plans, subdivision plans, and application materials, as well as potential impacts upon the environment and community; and

WHEREAS, official notice of the January 21, 2021 and February 18, 2021 meetings and public hearings were advertised in the Auburn Citizen newspaper for the requisite period of time under NYS Town Law and Town of Sennett Zoning Law prior to said meetings and public hearings; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board has carefully and fully considered the environmental record prepared for this action, including but not limited to the Applicant's October 6, 2020, SEQRA submissions, as updated and supplemented by submissions on November 13, 2020, and December 17, 2020, together with any comments received from the public and involved or interested agencies; and

WHEREAS, the SEQRA Regulations provide that for a Type 1 action "the lead agency making a determination of significance must: (1) consider the action as defined in sections 617.2(b) and 617.3(g) of [the SEQRA Regulations]; (2) review the FEAF Part 1, the criteria [for determining significance contained in the SEQRA Regulations] and any other supporting information to identify the relevant areas of environmental concern; (3) thoroughly analyze the identified relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment; and (4) set forth its determination of significance in a written form containing a reasoned elaboration and providing reference to any supporting documentation"; and

WHEREAS, the SEQRA Regulations also provide that to determine whether a proposed Type 1 action "may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, the impacts that may be reasonably expected to result from the proposed action must be compared against the criteria in [section 617.7(c)(1) of the SEQRA regulations]"; and

WHEREAS, after reviewing and completing FEAF Parts 1, 2 and 3 and after reviewing the criteria for determining significance set forth under Section 617.7(c)(1) of the SEQRA Regulations and analyzing the relevant areas of environmental concern, the Town Board has determined that the Project will not create any significant-adverse environmental impacts.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Board of the Town of Sennett hereby determines reaffirms and designates itself lead agency, that the Project will not have a significant adverse effect upon the environment such that an environmental impact

statement will not be prepared, for the reasons set forth in the Applicant's October 6, 2020 SEQRA submission(s), as supplemented by November 13, 2020 and December 17, 2020 submissions, and the Town Board's Determination of Significance and accompanying EAF Part III narrative attached hereto as Exhibit "A", and that a negative declaration is hereby issued pursuant to SEQRA.

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Resolution will be filed as required by the SEQRA Regulations and shall be readily accessible to the public and made available upon request, subject only to the limitations established by the NYS Freedom of Information Law.

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Town Supervisor is authorized to sign the FEF and file all necessary documents with the appropriate departments and agencies as required by the SEQRA Regulations.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Resolution shall take effect immediately.

The adoption of the foregoing Resolution was moved by Supervisor Gray seconded by seconded Councilman Adrian, and duly put to vote, which resulted as follows:

Councilman Michael Adrian yes
Councilman Richard Gagliardi yes
Councilman James Jeffers absent
Councilman Edward Rizzo yes
Supervisor Thomas Gray yes

The Resolution was thereupon duly adopted.

Resolution carried by a vote of 4 to 0, with one absent.

The board will take a ten-minute break and then continue with the water workshop.

Paul Chatfield, Town Engineer for the water project is now present. There is discussion on easements. Some people do not want to sign and give out some personal information. Attorney Andino will check on the requirements that are mandatory to include on the easements. If there is no money changing hands, it should not be necessary for the personal information. Paul Chatfield stated that he stopped on the way and looked at the sight and there is a ten-foot pipe there now, and we can not go under it, we need the easement to work around it. Attorney Andino asks if the town has received any signed easements back? No, not yet. There is discussion on easements needed for Jericho Road. There might be a change in the grant if the project is changed because of the lack of

the easements needed for that area. The feeling is that we will not now for sure until after the bids come in. There is discussion on this. Paul Chatfield has the updated maps for the Panna Easement. Project status - There is discussion on the need for this information/easements to put the job out to bid. There is discussion on changing the layout for the line or that the line would not be replaced on Jericho Road. There is more discussion on different options. The board asks Paul Chatfield to contact Kathy Dear about the difficulty that the town is having with the easements and the status of the grant in general.

Supervisor Gray moves to close the meeting, seconded by Councilman Adrian, 4 ayes, 0 nays, 1 absent, carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Penelope Dennis, Town Clerk