

**Village of Pittsford**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**  
**Special Meeting – February 13, 2012 at 5:00 PM**

**PRESENT:**

Chairperson:	Remegia Mitchell
Members:	Sally Chamberlin Meg Rubiano George Wallace
Planning Consultant:	John Steinmetz
Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

Chairperson Mitchell called the meeting to order at 5:00 P.M.

**Westport Crossing Development, 75 Monroe Avenue, Application for Special Permits for Multiple Dwelling Buildings and Restaurant**

**Present:** Mark IV: Chris & Anthony DiMarzo, Frank Hagelberg, Attorney Donald Riley, Vice President Marketing & Development; Bryan Powers, Engineer

**Discussion:** Chairperson Mitchell stated that at this meeting, Board members will discuss the Planning Consultant's review of the responses from Mark IV regarding the potential impacts of developing the land at 75 Monroe Avenue. She noted that two changes have been made since the original application materials were submitted to the Board: (1) the number of units has been reduced from 185 to 167, with the proportion of 1, 2, and 3 bedroom units remaining the same at  $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ , and  $\frac{1}{4}$ , respectively, and (2) the number of seats in the restaurant has been reduced from 150 to 125.

Mr. Steinmetz explained that the purpose of his review is to provide initial feedback to the Planning Board on the information contained in the response provided by Mark IV dated 11/12/11.

**Potential Areas of Impact**

**1. Cost of Community Services**

Mr. Steinmetz stated that the applicant has provided the likely revenues from the project and the breakdown of the fiscal impact to the school district, but that the Planning Board should note the following:

- ✓ The applicant should provide the analysis used to reach the conclusion that the property tax revenues generated from the development will more than offset the cost of providing fire, ambulance, and police services to the additional population.
- ✓ The applicant does not discuss the type or magnitude of the impact anticipated on the existing senior facilities and programs offered by the Town and Village.

Chairperson Mitchell asked whether the demands on the public works systems, sewers, etc., had been considered, and whether an engineer should be consulted regarding this issue. It was noted that this information has been provided by Mark IV, and that a summary of this should be included in this report.

**2. Access to the Erie Canal**

Mr. Steinmetz stated that he has no comment regarding access to the canal, and he suggested that the board consider referring this issue to SRF & Associates for additional comments.

**3. Circulation Patterns**

Mr. Steinmetz stated that no new information is contained in this report regarding pedestrian circulation patterns. He suggested that the Board refer the vehicular circulation patterns to SRF & Associates for additional clarification and comment.

**4. Impact on Local Parking Resources**

Mr. Steinmetz stated that the response provided by Mark IV regarding the impact on local parking resources is based upon anecdotal information and does not provide any detailed analysis. Any assessment of parking impacts within a downtown or central business district should include the number of available parking spaces, the current utilization during peak times, and the estimated parking demand created by the proposed development during those peak periods.

Board members discussed the issue of the lack of public parking in the Village, and noted that specific details regarding this issue were not provided. Member Wallace stated his opinion that since a large volume of vehicles pass through the Village on a daily basis, there would be little value in gathering additional information regarding this issue.

**5. Economic Impacts**

Mr. Steinmetz stated that no further action is required at this time regarding economic impacts.

**6. Residential Property Values**

Mr. Steinmetz stated that he discussed the proposed project with national experts in the real estate market, and the experts concurred with the applicant that these types of projects can result in many positive impacts to residential property. Also, it is difficult to quantify the impact on existing residential property values in the Rochester market, because there are too few comparables to draw from. He concluded that the Board may want to consult a professional real estate appraiser to determine if any additional information can or should be provided to address this issue.

**7. Consistency With Existing Development Patterns:**

This issue was referred to the APRB for review and comment. The APRB has concluded that the project is not compatible with the physical character of the Village.

**8. Noise and Odor**

Mr. Steinmetz stated that the applicant's response provides a thorough assessment of noise impacts associated with the residential living component of the project during peak hours. However, there is no discussion of the potential noise impacts of the 150+ seat restaurant with outdoor dining. It is reasonable to assume that the noise impact of the restaurant may be greatest during off-peak hours when background noise levels are relatively low.

Board members questioned the applicants as to the number of outdoor seats at the restaurant. Mr. DiMarzo stated that there will be between 25 and 40 outdoor seats. It was suggested that the Board compare the noise level of similar businesses to determine the impact. The applicants pointed out that the owner of the restaurant will also be the landlord of the apartments, so it will be in their best interest to restrict the noise level and the odors.

**9. Visual Resources**

Viewsheds: Mr. Steinmetz stated that a significant portion of the vegetation along Sutherland Street is deciduous in nature and loses its foliage during the fall and winter months. The response provided by the applicant did not provide any assessment of the visual impact of the project when the existing foliage is "leaf-off." The project's visibility increases during the winter months. He recommended that the Board further evaluate the visual impact of the proposed project during the 4 to 5 months of the year when the existing vegetation is "leaf-off." Board members decided to request additional photos from the applicant, and to conduct a site visit of the area around the project, to further evaluate the visual impact.

Lighting: No further information is required at this time. The Planning Board should require detailed lighting design as part of the site plan review.

**10. Historic Resources:** No further information is required.

**11. Home Ownership Rates**

Mr. Steinmetz stated that the applicant's response consists of a publication by the Urban Land Institute that adequately illustrates the benefits of higher-density developments. However, the article focuses on the impacts of density in general terms, and does not specifically address the issue of a significant shift in homeownership rates within a community caused by a single project.

Member Wallace referenced the Village's Comprehensive Plan, which recommends maintaining the existing balance of rental property and ownership in the Village.

**12. Aging in Place**

Mr. Steinmetz stated that the applicant may want to provide some census or market data that reinforces or illustrates the need for senior living options in the community and the region.

Mr. Hagelberg pointed out that the proposed project is within the requirements of the R-5 Zoning Ordinance; the number of units has been reduced by 10%; and the applicants have provided a 3D model for the Boards' review.

Chairperson Mitchell stated that this review will be continued at the February 27<sup>th</sup> PZBA meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business, Chairperson Mitchell adjourned the meeting at 6:30 pm.

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary