

Village of Pittsford
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
Regular Meeting – March 25, 2013 at 7:00 PM

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Remegia Mitchell
Members:	Meg Rubiano George Wallace (absent) Jill Crooker
Alternate:	Jason Rosenberg
Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Building Inspector:	John Limbeck (absent)
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

Chairperson Mitchell called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

PLANNING BOARD

Pittsford Canalside Properties, LLC, 75 Monroe Avenue ~ Preliminary Site Plan

Present: Chris DiMarzo, Peter Vars, BME Engineering

Discussion: Chairperson Mitchell stated that this is a continuation of an open public hearing for preliminary site plan review of the development at 75 Monroe Avenue. She explained that the discussion will be limited to whether the proposed plan is in conformity with the regulating plan.

Mr. Turner explained that as predicate to site plan review, the Board is required to ensure that the development is in conformity with the site's regulating plan and design guidelines, as set forth by the Village of Pittsford. He further stated that in terms of determining conformity with the regulating plan and guidelines, the applicant is permitted a reasonable variance from the building footprints.

Mr. Steinmetz reviewed some of the items from Resolution #20 of 2012 for the Board's consideration in determining whether the proposed site plan is in conformity with the regulating plan:

1. The permitted location, or footprint, of buildings;
2. The orientation of the façade of the buildings;
3. The maximum height and mix of sizes of the buildings on the property;
4. The maximum length of the buildings on the property;
5. Areas separating buildings, such as driveways and pedestrian pathways;
6. Building façade composition and variation of façade design;
7. Required building entryways;
8. Location of streets, sidewalks, tree lawns, and public realm lighting;
9. Location of public realm features along the canal;
10. Location of trees, landscaping, and buffer areas along streets and property edges;
11. Location of parking areas and associated driveways and entrances;

12. Location of active and passive recreation areas on the site; and
13. Location of accessory structures, including storage and trash collection facilities.

Mr. Steinmetz explained that certain of these elements are easily identified, such as location and number of parking spaces. He stated that the footprint of a building refers to the total lot coverage of the building, not including landscaping.

Chairperson Mitchell pointed out that there is no specific language in the guidelines indicating how to measure the width of buildings.

Mr. DiMarzo stated that he could provide a comparison of these elements to the current proposed plan. He stated that:

- ◆ The footprint/building coverage of the proposed site plan is within 3% of the total size of the regulating plan;
- ◆ The length of the buildings is 150 feet less than the regulating plan;
- ◆ The orientation of the buildings is similar to the regulating plan;
- ◆ The maximum height of the buildings will not exceed the limits of the regulating plan;
- ◆ The separation between the buildings is in conformance with the building code;
- ◆ The façade composition/variation is consistent with the regulating plan in that all the buildings have different facades;
- ◆ The entryways are consistent with the regulating plan in that there are multiple points of entry and access;
- ◆ The location of the streets has remained consistent;
- ◆ Public realm & recreation areas: Dock, gazebos, swimming pool, etc.;
- ◆ Trees, landscaping, buffer areas – applicant will provide a comparison of the total green space between the two plans;
- ◆ Location of parking: there are 330 parking spaces planned: 162 underground, 138 surface, 30 attached garages; and
- ◆ Storage of property maintenance gear: there will be bays in freestanding garages for storage of maintenance equipment.

Chairperson Mitchell questioned whether the pathways between the buildings were in conformance with the regulating plan. Mr. Vars stated that there is an elevation change in the proposed plan, but that the pathways are consistent with the regulating plan.

Mr. DiMarzo stated that he will submit a chart comparing the parking and the building and lot coverage between the proposed plan and the regulating plan.

Chairperson Mitchell opened the hearing to the public at this time, and the following people spoke:

Margaret Caraberis, Historic Pittsford, submitted a letter, a portion of which she read at the meeting:

“Due to the significant deviation from the regulating plan and as submitted to the Lead Agency and Involved Agencies under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA),

the Board of Directors of Historic Pittsford strongly urges a re-examination of the altered site plans under both of these rules.”

Mary Menzie, Historic Pittsford, stated that the square footage of the restaurant and clubhouse has been substantially changed from the regulating plan. She also asked if the clubhouse and pool will be open to the public. Mr. DiMarzo stated that the pool is a private pool for the residents of the complex.

Art Pires, 70 State Street, asked about the stormwater management plan and the location of the 4-story buildings.

Chairperson Mitchell stated that stormwater issues will be dealt with in site plan review, and the location of the 4-story buildings will be reviewed by the APRB.

Jack Cargill, 8 Boughton Avenue, asked for a clarification of the difference in building coverage between the current proposed plan and the regulating plan. Mr. DiMarzo stated that the building coverage in the current plan is 3% greater than the regulating plan.

Justin Vlietstra, Boughton Avenue, stated that the regulating plan calls for no more than 28% of the buildings to be four stories in height. Mr. DiMarzo stated that he will provide information indicating that the proposed plan is in conformance with the regulating plan.

Chairperson Mitchell stated that the public hearing will remain open, and be continued at a special meeting to be held at 7:00pm on April 8th.

Minutes:

Motion: Chairperson Mitchell made a motion, seconded by Member Rubiano, to approve the 2/25/13 meeting minutes, as revised.

Vote: Rubiano – yes; Mitchell – yes; Rosenberg - yes. ***Motion carried.***

Adjournment: There being no further business, Chairperson Mitchell adjourned the meeting at 8:30 pm.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary