

VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
Special Meeting – January 15, 2014 at 7:00 PM

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Remegia Mitchell
Members:	Meg Rubiano George Wallace Jill Crooker Joe Maxey
Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Building Inspector:	John Limbeck
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

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

Pittsford Canalside Properties, LLC, 75 Monroe Avenue ~ Final Site Plan
Present: Chris DiMarzo, Bryan Powers, Mark IV; Peter Vars, BME Engineering; Frank Pavia, Attorney

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

The Secretary read the legal notice that was published in the January 2, 2014 edition of the Brighton Pittsford Post: *“Please take notice that a public hearing will be held before the Village of Pittsford Planning Board at the Village Hall, 21 North Main Street, Pittsford, New York, on Wednesday, January 15, 2014 at 7:00 pm, to consider an application made by Pittsford Canalside Properties, LLC for final site plan approval for the property located at 75 Monroe Avenue, pursuant to Village Code § 210-85.”*

Discussion: Mr. Pavia presented a summary of the history of the development process for Westport Crossing and the current status of the project. Mr. Vars stated that the final site plan being proposed is consistent with the approved preliminary site plan, and that any modifications that have been made to the site plan were addendums that were added to address comments from the Village. He noted that the size of the entrance and exit lanes has been reduced, and that additional trees and landscaping have been added for screening purposes. He also stated that there will be a 6-foot fence to screen the pool area, and the sidewalk on the south side has been extended to create a continuous pedestrian sidewalk path.

Chairperson Mitchell stated that the grade of the area abutting Monroe Ave is below the bridge, so that a pedestrian’s view traveling south would be only of the tops of the trees. Chairperson Mitchell also noted that there is an alteration in the topography around the restaurant, which is five feet lower than Monroe Avenue, and the parking lot is two feet below the restaurant. She questioned if, as alterations are made to the elevations, the views will remain similar to the views provided by the simulated drawings.

Board members discussed whether the proposed plan provides adequate areas for the public, such as sitting areas that are pedestrian amenable. Chairperson Mitchell requested that more detail be provided regarding the pedestrian amenities. The applicants noted that the mechanical items will be screened by gazebos.

Member Rubiano questioned whether the swimming pool area is adequately screened from the pedestrian walkway. The applicants stated that there will be a fence, an elevation difference, and distance between the pool and the walkway. The combination of these elements will provide adequate screening of the pool from the canalside pedestrian walkway.

Board members noted that the landscaping is sparse along the railroad tracks. The applicants stated that trees cannot overhang onto the rail system. They further noted that shrubs will provide screening in that area and that some of the shrubs are intended to reach mature height of six feet.

Chairperson Mitchell stated that the site plan should include foundation plantings and low-profile shrubs and bushes around the buildings. She stated that the applicants will need to provide more detail on the public-friendly areas of the development, and she requested that a licensed landscape architect attend a future meeting to clarify all of the landscaping issues. Mr. DiMarzo stated that he would supply a detail on typical foundation plantings for the Board's review. Chairperson Mitchell also noted that the comprehensive photometrics plan for the lighting of the development will need to be added to the final site plan, to insure that a safe walking environment is provided, without excessive lighting. This plan must include building mounted lights for all structures.

There was some discussion as to whether the need for variances will affect the granting of site plan approval. This will be determined at a future date. Member Maxey questioned whether the Canal Corporation has reviewed the project. Mr. DiMarzo stated that they are waiting for additional information from them. Also noted was that the applicants need to demonstrate how 1/2 of 1% of the overall project budget will be spent on art, and where it will be located.

Public Hearing Opened: Chairperson Mitchell opened the public hearing at this time, and the following persons spoke:

Jack Cargill, Boughton Avenue, stated that since the Village Board of Trustees granted a special permit to install the restaurant at the center of the development, why does the site plan propose installation of the restaurant at the entrance on Monroe Avenue?

Grant Fowler, Village Grove, expressed support for the development, stating that it would have a positive effect on the community.

Sharon Eastman, Elmbrook Drive, questioned whether the parking in the rear of the building complies with the Village Code.

James Eastman, Elmbrook Drive, stated that the special use permit approved by the Trustees states that final plans can deviate from the approved regulating plan in only three areas: footprint, façade appearance, and mix of building story sections. Can the Board explain how the submitted site plan meets this standard?

Other questions submitted by Mr. Eastman are as follows:

- Village R-5 Code section 210-19.5H states, “Parking shall be located in interior garages, under building garages, and behind buildings where it is screened from view of the street and canal.” How does the site plan meet this standard?
- Village Code states, “Entrances to dedicated and privately maintained streets serving residential dwellings shall have the physical character of historic Village intersections.” Please explain how the long turning radius, entrance road width, and median meet that standard?

Mike Reynolds, Church Street, stated that parking for the project is generally inadequate, since there is no public parking in the vicinity to accommodate this residential development, which includes a restaurant.

Janet Reynolds, Church Street, expressed concern with the small size of the proposed trees. She suggested that larger, more mature trees be transplanted to provide adequate screening. She also stated that this development does not match the character of the Village.

Fran Kramer, Golf Avenue, stated that the current project, as proposed, is not in conformance with the Regulating Plan that was approved by the Board of Trustees. She asked why the Planning Board is considering final approval for a plan that is different from that which was approved by the Board of Trustees.

Eric Bond, Stone Road, stated that since the stormwater issue at the Sutherland Street easement has not been resolved, the Planning Board should postpone their decision until it has been resolved.

Justin Vlietstra, Boughton Avenue, submitted a number of photos and questioned the Board as to how the placement of large buildings toward the rear of the site enhances the visual quality and protects the outstanding scenic resources, as required by the Village Code. He also stated that the submitted photos indicate how much of a building will be visible from Sutherland Street.

Katherine Smith questioned whether the current proposed plan conforms to the standards of the special permit.

Amy Vleitstra, Boughton Avenue, asked whether any variances had been granted.

Collette Yon, Rand Place, stated that she is concerned with the expansion of the width of the buildings, and that the plan is not appropriate for a small Village.

Kate Kolthoff stated that the project could be a benefit to the Village, but that the Board should take into consideration the issues raised by the public.

Lisa Cove, South Main Street, stated that the Board should consider the issues raised by the public comments, and that the Village does not need this project.

Margaret Caraberis, South Main Street, stated that the public should be able to review the current plans, and she questioned whether the amount of greenspace conforms with the R-5 Code. She also stated that the parking for the proposed restaurant is not adequate. She suggested that the Board should continue the Public hearing until these issues are resolved.

Chairperson Mitchell explained that the site plans are available to the public at the Village Hall. She also stated that the plan is a work in progress; as revisions are made, addendums are submitted to the Village.

Ken Morrow, Sutherland Street, stated that the lighting for the development should be cast downward, and industrial noise should be mitigated, so as not to disturb the surrounding neighbors.

Alyssa Plummer, South Main Street, stated that the process of allowing applicants to submit plans on the night of the meeting is improper.

Wally Morse, Sutherland Street, stated that he supports the project.

Chairperson Mitchell stated that these questions and comments will be compiled and responded to at a future time.

Mr. Pavia requested that the Chairperson close the public hearing at this time. Chairperson Mitchell stated that it would not be appropriate to close the public hearing at this point. The applicants requested that the the Board take a vote as to whether to close the public hearing at this meeting.

Motion: Chairperson Mitchell made a motion, seconded by Member Rubiano, to hold the public hearing open.

Vote: Rubiano – yes; Mitchell – yes; Crooker – yes; Maxey – yes; Wallace - yes. **Motion carried.** The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on January 15, 2014.

Adjournment: There being no further business, Chairperson Mitchell adjourned the meeting at 9:00 pm.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary

Village of Pittsford documents are controlled, maintained, and available for official use on the Village of Pittsford Website, located at <http://www.VillageofPittsford.org>. Printed versions of this document are considered uncontrolled. Copyright © (2010) Village of Pittsford.