

**Village of Pittsford
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
Regular Meeting – March 26, 2012 at 7:00 PM**

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Remegia Mitchell
Members:	Sally Chamberlin Meg Rubiano George Wallace (absent) Lili Lanphear
Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Building Inspector:	Edward Bailey
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

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

PLANNING BOARD

Mitch Odinak, 1 Durham Way ~ Addition

Present: Mr. & Mrs. Odinak

SEQR: Chairperson Mitchell stated that this is a Type II SEQR Action under SEQR § 617.5(c).

The Secretary read the legal notice that was published in the March 15, 2012 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 Monday, March 26, 2012 at 7:00 pm, to consider an application made by Mitch & Patti Odinak, owner of property located at 1 Durham Way, for site plan approval for the construction of an addition where the total floor area exceeds 400 square feet, pursuant to Village Code § 210-83B(15).”*

Discussion: The applicants presented plans for a two-story addition to be installed on the rear of their house, located at 1 Durham Way. They are also proposing renovating the existing deck, modifying the site grading to accommodate the addition, and installing a fence in the backyard. Board members questioned the applicants as to whether there will be any trees removed, and they replied that three trees will be removed.

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

- ◆ **John Limbeck, 62 State Street**, stated that he supports the applicants’ proposal.
- ◆ **Robert Michaels, 71 State Street**, stated that he supports the application, that it will enhance the property, and no adverse conditions will be created by this project.
- ◆ **Pam Marsocci, 3 Durham Way**, asked the applicants whether the installation of the fence will affect the landscaping near her property. They replied that the fence will be on their property and the landscaping will be maintained.

Public Hearing Closed: Chairperson Mitchell closed the public hearing at this time.

Motion: Chairperson Mitchell made a motion, seconded by Member Lanphear, to approve the application for an addition, as submitted.

Vote: Chamberlin – yes; Mitchell – yes; Lanphear – yes; Rubiano – yes. **Motion carried.** The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 26, 2012.

- There are no undesirable changes that will be produced in the character of the neighborhood by approving this site plan.
- The site plan will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the neighborhood or district.
- The benefit sought cannot be achieved by some feasible method.
- The requested site plan approval is not substantial.

Aaron Fleischer, 1 Grove Street ~ Review of Special Use Permit

Discussion: Chairperson Mitchell stated that at a regular meeting of the Village Zoning Board held on March 28, 2011, the Board voted to approve Mr. Fleischer’s application for operation of Bikram Yoga classes at a studio in the building located at 1 Grove Street, with the condition that the Planning Board would review the permit approval in one year. The Building Inspector reported that there have been no issues or problems with this business.

Public Hearing Opened: Chairperson Mitchell opened the public hearing at this time.

Public Hearing Closed: Chairperson Mitchell closed the Public Hearing at this time, as there was no one wishing to speak for or against this application.

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 the Board will review the draft findings of fact for the 75 Monroe Avenue development, and discuss any questions or concerns raised by board members. Member Lanphear raised the issue of the problem of overcrowding in the restaurant/bar area. It was determined that the Board of Trustees will address this issue during the Special Permit review process, and the Planning Board can recommend that the Trustees take into account parking resources created by the restaurant bar use. Member Lanphear also raised a concern that the proportional shift in the ratio of home ownership to rental property would change the character of the Village. Another issue discussed by the Board was that although the applicants have stated that the development will be targeted toward retired persons and empty nesters, there is no guarantee that this will be the part of the community that chooses to reside in the development.

Motion: Chairperson Mitchell made a motion, seconded by Member Chamberlin, to adopt the Recommendations to the Board of Trustees, as edited at tonight's meeting, for Special Use Permits Requests for 75 Monroe Avenue. The recommendations are attached to these minutes and made a part hereof.

Vote: Chamberlin – yes; Mitchell – yes; Lanphear – yes; Rubiano – yes. **Motion carried.** The decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 26, 2012.

Building Inspector's Report:

Mr. Bailey reported that:

- ✓ Yotality, at 6 South Main Street, will be opening in 3 weeks.
- ✓ The owner of 73 South Main Street will be applying for a second-story addition to the house.
- ✓ The Pittsford Dairy will be testing plant equipment in 2-3 weeks.
- ✓ Starbucks has submitted a preliminary plan for the parking lot.

Liaison Update:

Trustee Galli reported that:

- ✓ A series of meetings will be held to address ways to promote the Village.

Minutes:

Motion: Chairperson Mitchell made a motion, seconded by Member Chamberlin, to approve the 2/27/12 meeting minutes, as drafted.

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

Motion: Chairperson Mitchell made a motion, seconded by Member Chamberlin, to approve the 3/6/12 meeting minutes, as drafted.

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

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

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary

**Pittsford Village Code, §210-19.2.B.(3)(b)
RECOMMENDATIONS**

To: Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees
From: Village of Pittsford Planning Board
Date: March 26, 2012
Re: Special Use Permits Requests for 75 Monroe Avenue, Pittsford, New York

Section 210-19.2.B.(2)(3)(b) requires that any request for Special Use Permits in the R-5 zone, in the Village of Pittsford shall be referred to the Planning Board to make recommendations to the Board of Trustees with regard to items [1] through [7] of Subdivision B.(2)(3)(c) of that above mentioned section.

The Planning Board is cognizant of the fact that there are two applications for special use permits with regard to the property located at 75 Monroe Avenue in the Village of Pittsford. The first is for a multi-family development, consisting of 167 units, and the second being for a 125-seat restaurant. In its review, the Planning Board did not consider the impacts of the two requested special use permits separately, but chose to review the impact of the requested uses as a combined project. Obviously, if the Board of Trustees feels that additional investigative work is required, this matter can be referred back to the Planning Board for such purpose.

(c)[1] Access to the site and the size of the site is adequate for the proposed use.

Based upon SRF's conclusion that the access to the site as currently designed is adequate, the Planning Board can affirmatively recommend that access to the site is adequate for the proposed use.

The size of the site: there is no minimum lot size set forth in the R-5 Code. However, the proposed development does appear to meet all of the applicable code requirements with the exception of parking. This project provides for 351 spaces, where the Code would require 358. However, the applicant's position, a position which the Planning Board finds to be reasonable, is that with the combined uses of this project, and with the thought that many of the restaurant patrons will also be residents of the multi-family development, the actual parking spaces required will be less than 351.

In addition, the project conforms with the R-5 density requirements as follows:

- The traffic study submitted by the applicant and reviewed by the Village's traffic consultant confirms that traffic will be able to enter and leave the site and that traffic generated by the proposed development will not have a negative impact on existing traffic conditions in the area.
- The site contains 7.4 acres.
- Preliminary plans for the space proposed for the restaurant and related facilities include:
 - Restaurant building footprint (approx.):
3,784± sq. ft.
 - Outdoor area around restaurant building (approx). 8,816± sq. ft.
 - Parking area (70 spaces @ 9' x 18'): 11,340+ sq. ft.

Total

23,940± sq. ft.

(0.55 acres)

- The net area of the site (after deducting space for the proposed restaurant and related facilities) is 6.85 acres.
- The proposed residential development includes 167 units.
- Site density (167 units on 6.85 acres) is 24.4 units per acre, which is within the R-5 maximum density of 25 units per acre.

It should be noted, however, that it is possible that the scale and mass concerns that the majority of the APRB have with this project as more fully set forth below, might be able to be addressed on a larger site.

The Planning Board reviewed the impact of the existence of a restaurant at this location on the community. However, it should be pointed out that no review was made with regard to the potential impacts and the adequacy of the site in the event that weddings or other large events were to be held at the restaurant. The Trustees may wish to deal with this as a condition or conditions in any restaurant special permit which might eventually be granted. The Planning Board recommends that the Trustees take into account the parking resources required by the restaurant/bar use in granting any restaurant Special Use Permit.

(c)[2] The proposed development will be compatible, in terms of scale, massing, orientation, and architectural design with the visual character of the Village, and will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood or be detrimental to the residents thereof.

The Planning Board felt that the first portion of this standard, that is, “The proposed development will be compatible, in terms of scale, massing, orientation and

architectural design, with the visual character of the Village...” more properly fell within the expertise of the Village of Pittsford Architectural Preservation and Review Board. To that end, the Planning Board requested that the APRB provide a recommendation with regard to this standard.

The applicant worked extensively with the APRB and ultimately came up with a design which became known as Canal Commercial.

In connection with its review, the APRB retained the services of Ted Bartlett of Crawford & Sterns, a noted historic preservation architect.

Mr. Bartlett concluded that in its final concept form, the project would be compatible in terms of scale, massing, orientation, and architectural design, with the visual character of the Village of Pittsford.

However, at a meeting of the Architectural and Preservation Review Board, held on the 4th day of January, 2012, the APRB determined that the final concept plan presented to them demonstrated that the proposed development would not be compatible, in terms of scale, massing, orientation and architectural design with the visual character of the Village of Pittsford. It should be noted that this was a 3-2 vote. The three members who voted for incompatibility did so based on the scale and massing of the project.

While the APRB found that the scale and massing of the project was not compatible with the architectural design and the visual character of the Village, it must be pointed out that there is a certain amount of compatibility with the larger scale uses which surround the site such as the school, the Public Works facility, the State buildings, and the Pittsford Village Green Office Park, etc.

The Board voted unanimously that the concept plan provides that varied roof heights, projecting bays, gables, recesses and portions have been used to visually divide larger buildings to produce a scale that is visually compatible with the Village's distinct aesthetic character. The concept plan also avoids uniform building designs, and individual buildings within groups of buildings are designed to create unique and distinct identities.

(c)[2]&[3] The proposed development ... will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood nor be detrimental to the residents thereof. The proposed use will not create a hazard to health, safety, or the general welfare.

The Planning Board engaged the services of Steinmetz Planning Group in developing a responsive recommendation with regard to these two standards.

In reviewing the impact of the proposed uses with regard to these two standards, the Planning Board, with Mr. Steinmetz help, examined 12 areas of impact in preparing a recommendation for the Board of Trustees.

I. Cost of Community Services.

School.

Based upon the demographics expected by the applicant, the increase in school attendance and the increase in school tax revenue, the Pittsford Central School District has indicated to the applicant that they will be able to accommodate any additional school population generated by this project. According to financial estimates provided by the applicant, it is reasonable to assume that the School District will realize a net gain in revenue from this project. This is due to the limited number of school aged children expected to reside at Westport Crossing as compared to the school tax that the owner of the project will pay.

Fire.

The Pittsford Fire District has in place a long range plan which incorporates new areas of residential and business development. That plan provides that service for the new development will be absorbed and provided by the additional tax revenue that the new development generates. The Fire District indicated that they would be unable to provide a letter of serviceability until the final site plan is in place.

Ambulance.

Pittsford Volunteer Ambulance has indicated that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the Pittsford Volunteer Ambulance operations and that the ambulance district tax collected from the proposed development would offset any increase in the cost of their operations.

Law Enforcement Services.

The applicant has indicated that the Monroe County Sheriff's Department, together with New York State Police, provide law enforcement services to the Town and Village. The applicant further indicated that there was no direct charge for these services, and therefore the financial impact on the Town and Village would be non-existent because any increased law enforcement protection would be funded by the increased tax dollars resulting from the development.

Senior Services.

According to the 2010 Census, approximately 5,130 persons, age 65 and over, reside in the Town and Village of Pittsford. Even if the entire population of this proposed development were to be age 65 and older, it would be a negligible increase in the over-65 population, and therefore a minimal impact on services required for seniors.

Water Supply.

Pursuant to a letter from the Monroe County Water Authority, certain improvements would be required in order to provide an adequate supply of water to this development. Provided that any special use permit requires that all requirements of the Monroe County Water Authority will be met in providing fresh water to this development, an adequate supply of water for this development appears to be assured.

Sanitary Sewer Service.

According to the Village engineer, the project will require the construction of either sanitary waste water holding tanks or a rebuilt filter system to ensure the adequacy of the siphons running under the Canal. Any special permit that the Trustees might grant to this applicant should have a condition that the applicant will make whatever improvements to the sanitary sewer service and connection thereof to the Village sewer system that are recommended by the Village engineer which are required by this project.

Gas and Electric.

Rochester Gas & Electric has agreed to provide electric and gas service to the development should the special use permit be granted. It should be noted that all utility lines, including cable, will be buried. Therefore, there will be no unsightly overhead utility lines.

Storm Water Management.

The Village engineer has no issues with regard to the effect of this development on storm water management, and the issue will be more thoroughly dealt with in site plan review should the Trustees grant the special use permits.

II. Access to the Erie Canal.

This project provides roadway and sidewalk access within the development to the Erie Canal. In addition, with the improvements made to the entry way to the site, the ability of pedestrians and cyclists to cross between the Canal access provided by this project and the existing Canal path on the opposite side of the Canal has been assured.

Modification of the approach on the westerly side of the Monroe Avenue Bridge is also a principal factor contributing to the increased safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

It should be noted that the Planning Board will continue to work with the applicant and SRF through the site plan review process to continue to refine the project with the thought of Canal access in mind, and also with the thought of pedestrian and cyclist safety crossing between the project's Canal access and the Canal path on the westerly side of the Canal.

III. Circulation Patterns.

Of great concern to the Planning Board was the issue of maintaining, in this development, the walkable environment which makes the Village of Pittsford a great place to live. The three key ingredients of a successful walking community are connectivity, safety, and the physical environment. The sidewalks of this development will be connected to the Village's and Town's sidewalk system, which will allow for pedestrians circulation to and from the Central Business District (CBD) and to and from the Canal towpath.

The sidewalks proposed for this development are separated from the roadway by a tree lawn for safety purposes. Also the increase of the number of Village residents that will result from the development will provide additional "eyes on the street" within the

project site and along Monroe Avenue, which will add to the perceived and actual safety of new and existing Village pedestrians.

The architectural quality of the proposed development, along with the greenways contained within the development will positively contribute to the walking environment of the project and the Village.

The issue of vehicular circulation is dealt with in the traffic response more fully set forth below, however the applicant has represented that the project has been designed to be in compliance with the Complete Streets Policy.

IV. Impact on Local Parking Resources.

While the current proposed development substantially satisfies the Village's off street parking requirements, (351 spaces where 358 are required) the Planning Board was concerned with the impact of this development on the perceived shortage of parking resources throughout the Village, particularly at peak times. Peak times were defined as the evening commuter period and other special events, such as weddings or church services.

The applicant conducted an inventory of existing public parking resources, and utilization rates of the CBD. The results of the inventory indicated that, there are a total 470 spaces available within the Village's Four Corners area. During the four day study, the applicant observed that approximately 134 to 165 of the spaces were available during the 3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. time period. As a result, there appears to be public parking resources available during peak time periods to accommodate visitors arriving from 75 Monroe Avenue.

It should be noted that the proposed development is only a third of a mile from the CBD. It is the Planning Board's opinion that the project's close proximity to the CBD will result in a portion of the project's prospective residents visiting the CBD on foot or by bike. The Board should also be made aware that in the event that a visitor to the CBD is unable to find a parking space, he or she will likely adjust his or her schedule to patron the CBD in off-peak periods. Therefore, the Planning Board feels that the existing public parking resources are adequate to accommodate any potential impact on CBD parking caused by this project.

V. Economic Impact.

It is the Board's position that there are a number of vacancies in the CBD, the increase in the number of Village residents resulting from this development can only help the economic vitality of the CBD.

VI. Residential Property Values.

The impact of a project of this nature on Pittsford residential property values is very difficult to quantify, because there are too few comparables from which to draw.

However, it should be noted that the available research provided to the Board has suggested that quality rental housing has no negative impact on the price or frequency of sales of neighboring homes.

VII. Consistency with Existing Developing Patterns.

The issue of the compatibility of this proposed project with existing Village development was referred to and examined by the APRB. The APRB and the APRB's consultant agreed that the proposed character of the project using Canal Commercial Designs would permit the developer to draw from existing and historic Canalside

commercial properties, thereby making the proposed development compatible with the Village's existing development patterns.

As more fully set forth above, the majority of the APRB disagreed only with mass and scale, not with architectural design.

VIII. Noise and Odor.

The Planning Board emphasized the importance of the peace and quiet that is currently enjoyed in the Village of Pittsford. The Planning Board was concerned that the influx of new residents and the activity associated with the proposed project could negatively impact the current peace and quiet.

It is presumed that the largest increase in noise produced by the development will occur during the construction stage. This will not be a long-term impact, and therefore was not evaluated by the Planning Board.

The principal long term factors in any increase in noise would be normal site maintenance, such as lawn mowing, snow removal, etc. and traffic. The applicant provided a substantial amount of data, which allowed the Board to conclude that the increase in noise levels resulting from the proposed development would not be discernibly higher than the current ambient noise levels generated within the Village in that area.

With regard to the proposed restaurant use, the additional contributors to noise level would appear to be people dining outside, and any music that may be on the site inside or out.

The developer indicated that the lease for any tenant of the restaurant would include a restriction prohibiting live, recorded, or amplified music or singing outdoors

after a designated time, such as 10:00 p.m. It is in the applicant's best interest to limit noise emanating from the restaurant as that would have an extremely negative impact on the tenants in the multi-family development.

In addition, any special use permit issued for the restaurant by the Board of Trustees could contain a limitation with regard to the type of outside entertainment and a time limit for that entertainment.

As with noise, it is in the applicant's best interest to adequately control any negative odors generated by the multi-family project and/or the restaurant. Trash and refuse will be stored in appropriate vermin proof type containers within the basement garages, so that these containers will not be visible out on the site to pedestrians and from resident windows. In addition, all residential units and the restaurant will be equipped with garbage disposals so that organic matter will be disposed of rather than being placed in an outside source. Since the garbage will be stored indoors, this will also help eliminate any odors. The restaurant cooking hoods will be vented to a high point on the roof rather than through a wall. Proper sizing of the cooking hoods and associated equipment will also lend to a dilution of the cooking odors.

IX. Visual Resources.

Despite the fact that the APRB reviewed the project, the Planning Board still felt that it had, within its purview, a review of the project's impact on existing viewsheds.

The largest impact on any existing viewshed will occur as pedestrians, cyclists and occupants of automobiles travel easterly over the Monroe Avenue Canal Bridge. The existing view of the current 75 Monroe Avenue buildings, the school and related playing fields will be eliminated and replaced with the varied architectural fenestration of the

proposed project. A similar impact will result for vessels traveling on the Erie Canal and pedestrians utilizing the Canal path.

There will be a negligible impact on the relevant viewsheds from the Town residential properties located to the west (Town Side) of the Erie Canal as that viewshed consists primarily of a view of the New York State and Municipal buildings on the west side of the Canal and will continue to do so.

The Planning Board conducted a site visit along Sutherland Street to analyze the impact of the proposed project on the viewsheds looking west from Sutherland Street. It was clear from that site visit that the impact on western looking viewsheds would be minimal, and that while the very tops of the buildings at the proposed development would be visible while looking westerly from Sutherland Street, the view of downtown Rochester presently available would remain, and more importantly the roofline of any visible building will remain below the top of the hill line that can be viewed to the west from Sutherland Street. In addition, the westerly view moving north down Sutherland Street and any view of the tops of the buildings of the proposed development would be further screened by the Pittsford Village Green Office Park.

X. Historic Resources.

The Village of Pittsford has a wealth of historic resources. For example, according to the Historic Pittsford website, there are over 100 buildings of architectural distinction located within the Village. However, the most significant historic resource to be impacted by the proposed project is the Erie Canal. The removal of contaminated soils, the proposed restoration of the site, and the increased public enjoyment of the Canal provided by the project will enhance the Erie Canal's role in the community.

XI. Homeownership Rates.

The Village of Pittsford has a very high rate of homeownership – 72.7% according to the 2000 Census.

The Planning Board was extremely concerned with the impact on the Village of adding an additional 167 rental units in the Village. The Planning Board's consultant provided the Planning Board with a National Association of Realtors study, which concluded that there is some correlation between homeownership rates and increased educational attainment and civic participation, improved health benefits, reduced crime rates, and higher levels of property maintenance. With the exception of the property maintenance issue, all of the other concerns are primarily based upon "mover rates". It was concluded that where mover rates are high, educational attainment, civic participation, health benefits, and crime rates are all negatively impacted. Mover rates are higher among households below the poverty level and in younger households.

One of the primary target markets for this development is retired persons and empty nesters. The available data suggests that these two groups have very low mover rates, thus eliminating the negative impacts resulting from high mover rates.

However, other target groups for this proposed development are persons who are recently divorced and students. Mover rates for divorced people are higher than for married persons, and, this is one target market segment which could lead to negative impacts on the Village of Pittsford.

Both the Planning Board's consultant and the developer provided articles from The Urban Land Institute, which is an organization that is well respected by real estate professionals, such as developers and planners, and many other professions that deal with land and development. The ULI publications indicated that, generally, high quality

multi-family housing does not have a negative impact on the residential communities in which they are located.

Neither the applicant nor the Planning Board's consultant could direct the Planning Board to or provide the Planning Board with any authoritative or objective reference, which would allow the Board to find and quantify the impact of the rental versus ownership component of this project on the Village of Pittsford. As of the preparation of these recommendations, the Planning Board's consultant had contacted two well-qualified and nationally known planning experts who were unable to articulate any discernible impact that a large rental property would have as compared to a large owner occupied project. In an effort to bring closure to this question, the Planning Board's consultant has contacted the Urban Land Institute directly. They have agreed to look at this issue on our behalf. When/if the Planning Board receives a response from ULI, the Planning Board will provide an additional written report to the Board of Trustees.

With regard to the property maintenance issue, there can be little question that the rental of, as opposed to ownership of, one and/or two family residential units generally results in concerns with regard to the maintenance and upkeep of the rented units. Absentee landlords are generally not as concerned with property maintenance as homeowners who occupy their property.

The applicant has made the very persuasive point, with which the Planning Board agrees, that no such disincentive exists for the owner of a multi-family development of this size, as a failure to properly maintain the property has a negative impact on the owner's ability to rent the units. This developer has a long track record of building and

continuing to own its rental developments. Therefore, the Planning Board believes that the fact that these are rental units as opposed to condominium units will have no negative impact on the maintenance of this development.

The comprehensive plan of the Village of Pittsford provides that any further residential development in the Village should maintain the present balance of rental versus owner occupied properties. That proportion is approximately 27.3% rental and 72.7% owner occupied residences. The proposed development would alter the rental proportion from 27.3% to 43.8%.

The Board was concerned with this proportional shift, but it should be noted that the Planning Board could discover no objective or authoritative reference, which would indicate that this shift in the percentage of rental units would have an adverse impact on the Village of Pittsford.

XII. Aging in Place.

There is a growing collection of literature and groups (AARP, NCOA, etc...) that are articulating the needs of our aging population. The term "aging in place" refers to the ability to grow old in the community that you grew up in, or in which you raised your family.

According to the Monroe County Office for the Aging, in 1973 there were 97,000 residents, age 60 and over, in Monroe County. Today, there are over 122,000 and this number is accelerating, with the 85 + group growing the fastest. The median age in Pittsford is almost seven years older than the New York State average, and this too is accelerating.

Typically, seniors become less equipped to continue to reside in the single family residences in which they lived and raised a family.

The applicant's proposed 167 unit development will provide units that are accessible for seniors (elevators) and will not require a great deal of maintenance or effort on the part of those seniors. In short, the development would appear to be a means by which seniors who have lived their entire lives in the Pittsford area will be able to continue to live in this community.

At this point, with the data presently available to the Planning Board, the Planning Board can recommend that the proposed project will not adversely alter the essential character of the neighborhood nor be detrimental to the residents thereof, and that the proposed development will not create a hazard to health, safety, or the general welfare.

(c)[4] Public access and amenities are provided along the Canal shoreline, abutting the project.

The applicant has stated that there will be public access and amenities provided along the Canal shoreline, which abuts the project. The Planning Board will further develop and insure, during the site plan review process, that sidewalks, docks, promenades, benches and landscaping are present to ensure that the waterfront is easily accessed by the public.

(c)[5] The proposed density does not exceed a maximum of 25 dwelling units per acre.

The building inspector has issued an opinion which indicates that excluding the restaurant property from the project, the property remaining for the proposed multi-family development complies with this density requirement.

(c)[6] The applicant has demonstrated that the traffic generated by the proposed use will not be detrimental to the surrounding area.

SRF has thoroughly evaluated the traffic data supplied to it by the developer's expert. SRF has concluded that the impact of this project on area traffic will be negligible.

The principal concern of SRF is the speed of eastbound traffic coming over the Monroe Avenue Canal Bridge. Pursuant to a memorandum from SRF, SRF, the applicant, and DOT have agreed to certain modifications on the western side of the Monroe Avenue bridge to accomplish traffic calming and slowing. Any special use permit granted to this applicant by the Board of Trustees should have as a condition that any modification recommended by SRF for the purpose of calming and slowing traffic in the vicinity of this development should be completed.

A further condition of any approval from the Village of Pittsford should require that the 75 Monroe Avenue Project should comply with the Village's Complete Streets Policy.

(c)[7] Proposed building shall be unique and varied in design with a residential scale and articulation that relates to the Village of Pittsford's building traditions. This means:

[a] varied roof heights projecting bays, gables, recesses and porches shall be used to visually divide larger buildings to produce a scale that is visually compatible with the Village's distinctive aesthetic character; [b] uniform building designs are to be avoided and individual buildings within groups of buildings will be designed to create unique and distinct identities.

The APRB, by a unanimous vote, concluded that the proposed project complies with this standard.