

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
January 28, 2014

**PROCEEDINGS OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
January 28, 2014 – 7:00 PM**

**Present**

**Mayor:** Robert C. Corby (arrived at 8:15 pm)  
**Trustees** Lili Lanphear  
Lorie Boehlert  
Frank Galusha  
Tim Galli  
**Attorney:** Jeffrey Turner  
**Recording Secretary:** Dorothea M. Ciccarelli

**CALL TO ORDER**

Deputy Mayor Lanphear called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

**TREASURER’S REPORT – Dorothea M. Ciccarelli**

Mrs. Ciccarelli presented vouchers listed on Abstract #012 of 2013/14 fiscal year for approval. Trustee Galli personally reviewed vouchers. **Motion Trustee Galli, seconded by Trustee Boehlert**, to approve payment of vouchers listed on Abstract #012 in the amounts stated below and to charge them to the appropriate accounts.

**Abstract #012 – 2013/14**

General Fund (#437-#445), (#447-#458):	\$ 16,828.77
Sewer Fund (#446):	<u>\$ 1,151.16</u>
<b>Total vouchers for approval:</b>	<b>\$ 17,979.33</b>

**Vote:** Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

**FLOWER CITY PASTA**

Jon Stadt, owner of Flower City Pasta, discussed with the Board his intent to remodel his current business at 5 South Main Street. Mr. Stadt informed the Board he would like to start serving warm food at his current location. The menu would only have 1-2 items a day, which would include a soup and sandwich lunch. He also indicated that he would like to have an espresso machine. The Board questioned if he would be adding additional staff and whether there would be an increase in the deliveries to his site. Mr. Stadt informed the Board that he would not need more people nor would there be an increase in his supply deliveries. Mr. Stadt provided the Board with two possible floor plans that he was exploring for the business. The Board thanked Mr. Stadt and reviewed the process for the Special Use Permit and the next steps he would need to complete. Mr. Stadt understood he would need to go the Planning Board as the next step in the process.

**BUILDING INSPECTOR’S REPORT**

**Motion Trustee Boehlert, seconded by Trustee Galli**, to hold a Public Hearing at 8 PM on February 25, 2014 to consider proposed Local Law #4 of 2014 which will amend §210-4. Zoning Map.

**Vote:** Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
January 28, 2014

**Motion Trustee Boehlert, seconded by Trustee Galusha,** to hold a Public Hearing at 8 PM on February 25, 2014 to consider proposed Local Law #5 of 2014, which will Amend §76 Brush, Grass and Weeds.  
**Vote:** Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

**Motion Trustee Boehlert, seconded by Trustee Galusha,** to hold a Public Hearing at 8 PM on February 25, 2014 to consider proposed Local Law #6 of 2014, which will amend §105-15 Enforcement; penalties for offenses.  
**Vote:** Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

**Motion Trustee Galusha, seconded by Trustee Boehlert,** to hold a Public Hearing at 8 PM on February 25, 2014 to consider proposed Local Law #7 of 2014, which will amend §173-6 Dumpsters.  
**Vote:** Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

**Motion Trustee Boehlert, seconded by Trustee Galusha,** to hold a Public Hearing at 8 PM on March 11, 2014 to consider proposed Local Law #8 of 2014, which will amend §168-5 Signs.  
**Vote:** Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

#### **AUTHORIZATION FOR BID FOR GENERATOR FOR WOODCREEK**

Trustee Galusha reviewed with the Board the discussion he had with Scott Harter the Village Engineer. Mr. Harter suggested a couple of options which the village might be able to utilize. These options would save the village having to go out to bid. Trustee Galli commented that the specifications that he had reviewed regarding the options for generators were varied. Trustee Galusha felt further conversation with the Superintendent of Public Works was necessary to discuss if the department or the Town would be able to complete the installation work for the generator. Trustee Boehlert suggested that one of the vendors speak to the Board.

#### **MINUTES**

**January 14, 2014 – Village Board Minutes: Motion Trustee Galli, seconded by Trustee Boehlert,** to approve these minutes with corrections.  
**Vote:** Galli – Yes, Lanphear– Yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

**January 22, 2014 – Budget Workshop Minutes: Motion Trustee Boehlert, seconded by Trustee Galusha,** to approve these minutes.  
**Vote:** Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

#### **MEMBER ITEMS**

Trustee Galli introduced three policies (Online Banking Policy, Credit Card Policy, Cell Phone Policy) as suggested from the Procedure and Policies Review by the accountants. The Board thanked Trustee Galli for his work.

**Motion Trustee Galli, seconded by Trustee Galusha,** to adopt the Online Banking Policy, Credit Card Policy as corrected and Cell Phone Policy.  
**Vote:** Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion Trustee Galusha, seconded by Trustee Galli, to adjourn the meeting until 8pm.**

**Vote:** Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

**Motion Trustee Lanphear, seconded by Trustee Galli, to reopening the meeting.**

**Vote:** Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

**PUBLIC HEARING – PROPOSED LOCAL LAW #1 – TAX LEVY LIMIT OVERRIDE**

Proof of the legal notice below having been published, Trustee Lanphear opened the public hearing for Local Law #1 Tax Levy Limit Override.

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD  
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**

*Please take notice that a Public Hearing will be held before the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees, at a meeting on Tuesday, January 28, 2014 at 8:00 PM at the Village Hall, 21 North Main Street, Pittsford, NY, to consider proposed Local Law #1 of 2014, which law will override the tax levy limit established in General Municipal Law §3-c. as follows:*

**Section 1. Legislative Intent**

*It is the intent of this local law to allow the Village of Pittsford to adopt a budget for the fiscal year commencing June 1, 2014 that requires a real property tax levy in excess of the “tax levy limit” as defined by General Municipal Law § 3-c.*

**Section 2. Authority**

*This local law is adopted pursuant to subdivision 5 of General Municipal Law §3-c, which expressly authorizes a local government’s governing body to override the property tax cap for the coming fiscal year by the adoption of a local law approved by a vote of sixty percent (60%) of said governing body.*

**Section 3. Tax Levy Limit Override**

*The Board of Trustees of the Village of Pittsford, County of Monroe, is hereby authorized to adopt a budget for the fiscal year commencing June 1, 2014 that requires a real property tax levy in excess of the amount otherwise prescribed in General Municipal Law §3-c.*

**Section 4. Severability**

*If a court determines that any clause, sentence, paragraph, subdivision, or part of this local law or the application thereof to any person, firm or corporation, or circumstance is invalid or unconstitutional, the court’s order or judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this local law, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, subdivision, or part of this local law or in its application to the person, individual firm or corporation or circumstance, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment or order shall be rendered.*

**Section 5. Effective Date**

*This local law shall take effect immediately upon filing with the Secretary of State.*

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
January 28, 2014

Janet Reynolds, 35 Church Street: Questioned the Board as to how much they intended to override the tax levy.

Trustee Galli explained that the Board is just beginning the budget process and as they have in the past few years, they are passing this override as a preventive measure. There is a penalty if the municipality does not pass the override and inadvertently goes over the limit. The Village Attorney also commented that there are many ways to go over the limit without realizing you have. He also indicated that doing so would entail penalties. Trustee Boehlert commented that the Comptroller's office does not have a chance to perform these audits every year. However, when the Comptroller's do an audit and determine you have gone over the cap, penalties and special measures are enforced. If the tax override law has been passed, it would not matter if later it was discovered that we did exceed the cap amount.

Janet Reynolds, 35 Church Street: Questioned the Board as to what percentage the budget went over the tax cap the past few years. Trustee Galli commented he did not have that information in front of him, but he felt it was about 5% last year. Ms. Reynolds commented she was more interested now due to the Governor's proposal on the tax cap. Trustee Galli noted that if he read it correctly, the tax cap was about 1.48%, which is quite low. Ms. Reynolds stated this was something the Board should keep in mind as they go through the budget process. She felt that as a citizen she had no vote on the budget. The Board informed her that they would be having budget workshop meetings and she was welcome to attend.

Peggy Brizee, 81 South Main Street: Asked the Board if the tax cap percentage has anything to do with how taxes are currently split with the Town. Trustee Galli commented that the number is derived from a formula related to inflation and actually is received from the State Comptroller's Office, and has nothing to do with the Town.

Justin Vliestra, 19 Boughton Avenue: Asked if this tax cap is on the rate per \$1,000.00 charged or on the total revenue collected by the village. Trustee Galli commented it was on the tax levy, which appears on the tax bill. Mr. Vliestra questioned if the property values go up over 2% and the tax rate is maintained the same, would you go over the cap. Trustee Galli stated that no assessment changes have taken place, but that could affect the cap. Mr. Vliestra questioned if the sales tax revenue increased, would this affect the cap. Trustee Galli informed him this cap only has to do with the tax levy, from which the property taxes are collected.

Trustee Galusha informed the public of the upcoming budget meeting dates and invited the public to attend. Trustee Boehlert also informed the public that budget minutes appear on the website for the public to review.

There being no one else wishing to speak for or against this local law, **Motion Trustee Lanphear, seconded by Trustee Boehlert**, to close the public hearing.

**Vote:** Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

**Motion Trustee Galusha, seconded by Trustee Lanphear**, to approve the passage of Local Law #1 of 2014, the Tax Levy Limit Override.

**Vote:** Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

Mayor Corby arrived at 8:15 pm

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
January 28, 2014

**PUBLIC HEARING – PROPOSED LOCAL LAW #2 – Amend 210-114 – Planning Board**

Proof of the legal notice below having been published, **Motion Trustee Galli, seconded by Trustee Boehlert** to open the public hearing on local Law 2 which will amend 210-114 Planning Board.

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD  
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING**

*Please take notice that a Public Hearing will be held before the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees, at a meeting on Tuesday, January 28, 2014 at 8:00 PM at the Village Hall, 21 North Main Street, Pittsford, NY, to consider proposed Local Law #2 of 2014, which law will amend §210-114. Planning Board, of the Code of the Village of Pittsford.*

**Proposed Local Law #2 of 2014  
Amend §210-114. Planning Board**

**Amend §210-114.B. (4) as follows:**

*The Planning Board is authorized, when reasonable, to waive, in whole or in part, any of those factors contained in §210-84A as requirements for the approval, approval with modifications or disapproval of site plans submitted for approval and to waive in whole or in part any of those factors contain in Section 210-94 and 210-95 as requirements for the approval or approval with modifications of Special permits and Site Plans for telecommunication installations. The requirements of §210-84A may be waived only if one or more of the following is determined by the Planning Board and the requirements of Sections 210-94 and 210-95 may be waived only if one or more of the following is determined by the Planning Board:*

- (a) Any such factor or part thereof is found not to be required in the interest of the public health, safety or general welfare.*
- (b) Any such factor is inappropriate to a particular site plan.*
- (c) Any such factor will not mitigate adverse impacts generated by the proposed project, or will not aid in the buffering of dissimilar uses.*

**Vote:** Corby – Yes, Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

Justin Vliestra, 19 Boughton Avenue: Expressed concerns with the Planning Board being able to waive section 210-95. Additionally, he felt section 210-95 was more appropriate for the Zoning Board to review, instead of the Planning Board, given the number of requirements such as setbacks and visual requirements. He felt either section 210-95 should be removed from the local law or site the sections that the Planning Board is to review. Trustee Lanphear informed Mr. Vliestra this law applies to telecommunication towers only. Mr. Vliestra agreed, but felt that waiving section 210-94 was appropriate, but did not feel the Planning Board should be able to waive section 210-95. He expressed the opinion that section 210-95 should be left intact.

Trustee Lanphear commented that the language might need to be reviewed. She was concerned it could be used in other applications. Mayor Corby felt that the language was too generic for the application.

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
January 28, 2014

Trustee Galli suggested the Board members that it would be best to leave the public hearing open and come back to it at the next meeting.

Janet Reynolds, 35 Church Street: Stated that section 210-84 gave the Planning Board the power to dismiss a code requirement currently, and could not see a reason to give them any additional powers. Mayor Corby stated this law was being proposed due to the federal law that was passed that indicated that a community had to grant cell tower access if there is an existing cell tower facility. A municipality can regulate how they are mounted and what it looks like, but you cannot refuse access. Trustee Lanphear suggested that they take some time and look at the law and the current codes.

The Board will continue the public hearing on this matter on February 11, 2014 at 8 pm.

**PUBLIC HEARING – PROPOSED LOCAL LAW #3 – Amend Chapter 168 Signs**

Proof of the legal notice below having been published, **Motion Mayor Corby, seconded by Trustee Lanphear**, to open the public hearing on local Law 3 which will amend 168 Signs

***VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD  
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING***

*Please take notice that a Public Hearing will be held before the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees, at a meeting on Tuesday, January 28, 2014 at 8:00 PM at the Village Hall, 21 North Main Street, Pittsford, NY, to consider proposed Local Law #3 of 2014, which law will amend **Chapter 168 Signs** of the Code of the Village of Pittsford.*

***Proposed Local Law #3 of 2014  
Amend Chapter 168 SIGNS***

***Amend §168-5 F as follows:***

*No portable or temporary sign shall be placed on any elevation of a building or parked or otherwise located on any premises except as provided in § 168-6 A (3).*

***Remove §168-12. A. Re-letter remaining subsections.***

**Vote:** Corby – Yes, Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

Janet Reynolds, 35 Church Street: Commented she was unsure which type of sign this was referring to and she stated the legal notice was not very clear. She questioned the Board whether this meant no garage sale signs or banners, as she could not determine what the amendment was indicating. Trustee Lanphear commented this law was proposed to address the a-frame signs put out at the four corners or on the sidewalks, not garage sale signs. Mayor Corby explained that this law came about after merchants had requested a-frame signs to be placed on the sidewalk. The Village reviewed this with the Department of Transportation and with our insurance carrier who determined we cannot have signs in the right-of-way.

Justin Vliestra, 19 Boughton Avenue: Requested that the Board explain the difference between a sign and a banner. Mayor Corby responded that a sign is solid and ridged and a banner is made of fabric, canvas or plastic. Mr. Vliestra then questioned how the Board intended things to be advertised. He stated

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
January 28, 2014

banning the signs would lead to people putting the signs up illegally, which would not accomplish anything.

Mayor Corby informed the public that there are provisions for temporary signs so that a business can come in and obtain a permit to have the sign up the next day. There was a question from the audience as to what is the right-of-way. Mayor Corby explained the right-of-way is the area between the sidewalk and the curb including the sidewalk.

Mayor Corby reviewed the current law related to the temporary signs and the changes requested with the Board and the public. He clarified the intent was the removal of the sandwich board signs. He then indicated which signs were not affected by the law.

The Board stated that temporary type signs are allowed but not in the right-of-way due to the State Highway Law and village insurance. These signs could be placed in the front yard, but not in the right-of-way.

Trustee Galli commented to the Board that it might help in the future to write the rationale as to why the Board is taking the actions proposed since these types of changes do not come up very often.

Michael Reynolds, 35 Church Street: Commented to the Board that since the Village will not be allowing these types of signs, they should propose an alternative, since they do serve a purpose to the community. Mayor Corby informed the resident that there has been discussion of placing a permanent sign at the four corners and near Shoen Place to provide community exposure for events. Trustee Lanphear indicated that we have received a quote and a design for the sign. Mayor Corby also stated it would be a part of the budget process this year.

Justin Vliestra, 19 Boughton Avenue: Questioned how the use of the sign would be dictated. He asked whether certain agencies would have first rights to the use. Mayor Corby indicated it would be used on a first-come-first served basis.

Kendra Evans, 21 Boughton Avenue: Asked if the event sign would be able to be used by the merchants. Mayor Corby commented that the sign would be strictly for non-profit agencies. He further indicated that the village is not allowed to spend funds on commercial purposes. Ms. Evans further questioned what is being considered for the merchants in the Village. In addition, she expressed concern for the current vacant buildings on Main Street. She expressed the need to promote what we have available in the Village and questioned if the Board had a plan for doing that. Mayor Corby commented that the Board tries to meet periodically with the merchants, but they are limited as to what they can spend money on legally. The Mayor further explained since we are municipality we cannot spend funds on Commercial advertising, but we can spend funds if it is a general promotion of the community. Now is the time to approach the Village since we are beginning the budget process. Ms. Evans asked about signage opportunities for the merchants, since the a-frame signs were no longer allowed. Mayor Corby explained there is a formula to the size and number of signs a merchant is allowed to have. This is determined by the square footage of the business. The Mayor further explained that they have in the past reached out to the merchants and tried to assist them. From this collaboration, the Village currently removes the piles of snow from the sidewalk to provide better accessibility to the business. Mayor Corby further indicated that the current vacancies seem to be primarily one owner, and occupancy levels are back to the level prior to the recession.

There being no one else wishing to speak for or against this local law, **Motion Trustee Lanphear, seconded by Trustee Galusha**, to close the public hearing.

**Vote:** Corby – yes, Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
January 28, 2014

**Motion Trustee Lanphear, seconded by Trustee Galli**, to approve the passage of Local Law #3 of 2014, to amend chapter 168-5F- Signs.

**Vote:** Corby – yes, Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

**FRANK SCIREMAMMANO, F-E-S ASSOCIATES –REVIEW OF SEQR FOR 75 MONROE**

Mr. Sciremammano presented his report to the Board of Trustees and reviewed his qualifications, which include the following:

- BS, MS & PhD in engineering from the University of Rochester
- Licensed professional engineer in New York and New Jersey
- Professor of engineering at RIT for 32 years
- Over 38 years of environmental consulting specializing in land use and environmental regulation
- Member and past chairman of the Monroe County Environmental Management Council, Town of Brighton Conservation Board and Town of Brighton Planning Board

Mr. Sciremammano reviewed his scope of work for this project, which included the review of the previous SEQR Negative Declaration, the plans consistency and finally a report to the Village Board of his findings. He presented an overview of the approvals the project had received, applications filed with the Boards and the additional approvals needed for the project. These approvals include dedication of sewage facilities, approval of Monroe Avenue traffic improvements, review of the appeal of Preliminary Site Plan Approval (pending court action) and final action on request for revised Regulating Plan. All these approvals will need to be completed prior to final approvals. Mr. Sciremammano reviewed the changes in the plan, PZBA found 4 major deviations from approved concept. These include the number of buildings, arrangement of buildings, the shape of the buildings and the use of the space between buildings. The following new information was the drainage pipe running through the site found during remediation work. This pipe and associated drainage was not recognized or discussed as part of the Trustees environmental review and is now plugged and not functioning. Mr. Sciremammano discussed the potential significant Impacts and the primary issues during environmental review, which included:

- Aesthetic resources
- Historic resources
- Community character
- Project Design and Appearance Became Central Focus - Trustees agreed to a “canal commercial” design theme similar to Schoen Place

Mr. Sciremammano reviewed the design changes with the Board, which include the change from 7 primary residential buildings to 5 buildings with approximately the same total ground footprint and total length. This implies the individual buildings are bigger, wider and/or taller. The average building footprint is 27% larger and the average building is 15% wider. The relocation of the public restaurant reduces commercial activity on the canal frontage. This may change compatibility with Monroe Avenue as the village gateway. He further discussed the potential issues with the drainage pipe; the original environmental review includes drainage under headings “water impacts” and “public health and safety.” There was no discussion of the drainage pipe from the east. The Applicant has provided drawings of the replacement pipe but has indicated that Pittsford Canalside assumes no responsibility for the costs associated with the installation or ongoing maintenance of the improvements. The issue is still open and unresolved, and the consequences are not determined.

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
January 28, 2014

In conclusion, Mr. Sciremammano said the Board was justified in reviewing the previous SEQR Negative Declaration and should consider the following:

- Changes in the project plans with respect to impacts to aesthetic resources, historic resources and community character.
- Site and surrounding drainage to determine if the loss of the newly discovered drainage pipe may result in any significant adverse impact.

Mr. Sciremammano recommended as the next step that the Trustees notify the applicant of their review and give the applicant an opportunity to present their view on the changes and new information. The information the Board should request includes the March 5, 2012 concept plan and the current project plan drawing at a common scale. Also, they should review the approved ground level plan and the currently proposed building elevation at common scale. They should also request the visual simulations under the approved and proposed plans for comparison.

If the Trustees find that no significant adverse impacts will result, an amended negative declaration should be prepared, filed and published. If they conclude that a potential significant adverse impact may result, they must do the following:

- Inform the other Involved Agencies and the applicant.
- Provide a reasonable opportunity for the applicant to respond.
- If the Board's determination is the same, it must prepare, publish and file a Positive Declaration and follow the SEQR procedures for the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

Mr. Sciremammano recommended the Board look at the negative declaration, and the changes in the plan. Mayor Corby questioned if there were any time deadlines associated with the process. Mr. Sciremammano indicated it should be completed before the final approvals. Trustee Lanphear questioned if the variances needed now by the project, which were not needed when the original SEQR was completed, would be an issue. Mr. Sciremammano stated they were a part of the site plan changes to be considered. He further indicated that it was not unusual for variances to be needed that were not discovered at the concept level. Large variances are a part of the site plan changes you will want to consider in the Board's assessment. Mayor Corby asked how after they receive all the information, they determine if the information is accurate. Mr. Sciremammano commented there are no guidelines. It is up to the Board to determine what information they will need to make a determination. Mayor Corby reviewed with Mr. Sciremammano that the Board should compare the current plan to the previous SEQR and individually review each of the four areas you have determined and decide if it is a significant change in the plan. Mr. Sciremammano said to not only review the change, but also question if it is a significant adverse impact. Village Attorney, Jeff Turner, questioned if the Board had looked at a significant adverse impact on the first SEQR, in order to come to a positive SEQR review whether they need to look at a new impact. Mr. Sciremammano indicated the Board could look at the same area of concern, and should look at the areas that they indicated in the EAF as having the possibility of being a significant impact, but had justified later. He recommended looking at the four primary issues, and does not feel the Board needs to revisit areas such as traffic.

Trustee Galli mentioned the expert opinion of Crawford and Sterns in the report, and he questioned if one of the Boards commissioned an update. Mayor Corby and Mr. Sciremammano indicated the gentleman was not commissioned for this update. Trustee Galli questioned when the Board would receive the letter. Mayor Corby indicated the letter was distributed in early December. Trustee Galli and Trustee Boehlert indicated they had not received the letter. Trustee Galli questioned if the Board did not commission the update, how he could rely on it being independent, since it is hard to have confidence in conclusions, when I do not know what questions were asked and what documentation was provided. Mr.

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
January 28, 2014

Scioremammano stated the consultant could be independent since the Board has used the consultant prior and he was making a determination from the changes in the plan. Trustee Galusha indicated he had copies of the letter and could give a copy to the other Trustees.

Mayor Corby questioned how to construct your own logic as to whether it is a significant or not significant impact. Mr. Scioremammano felt the DEC did have some terms of compatibility the Board could use as a yardstick for comparison. However, he indicated it is a matter of subjective judgment, all the Board members should look at plan A and plan B and similar items in the community and decide if this will provide a significant adverse impact on the Village. Trustee Galli questioned if it was common for the Board to engage a consultant to help the Board go through this process. Or was it better for the Board to go through it on their own. Mr. Scioremammano indicated that it was appropriate to use a consultant to assist the Board with going over the guidelines, reviewing what the DEC says about compatibility, and making sure the plans are comparable. Mayor Corby indicated it made sense, especially since this has been such a contentious issue, it would help them to stick to what the law's intent is. Trustee Lanphear agreed with Mayor Corby and commented that having the plans that are able to be comparable plans, and additionally, having plans to scale would be extremely helpful. Mayor Corby and Trustee Lanphear agreed having the site plans in transparency form would provide the visual aspect, which would be extremely helpful. Trustee Boehlert questioned if this was something they could do legally at this time. Village Attorney, Jeff Turner, indicated he believed so. Mayor Corby stated they would be doing due diligence. Village Attorney, Jeff Turner, commented the final approval has clearly not happened yet. Mayor Corby questioned the status of the sewer. The Village Attorney stated it was a better question for the building inspector, but thought something was submitted. Mayor Corby indicated he would speak to Building Inspector to see about the plans. The Board thanked Mr. Scioremammano for his report and requested he provide them with a quote to assist them with reviewing the information to help them in the determination.

**AUTHORIZATION FOR THE MAYOR TO SIGN CLG GRANT PAPERWORK**

Mayor Corby reviewed with the Board the history behind the historic district borders. CLG offers grants to write historic district submissions. Trustee Boehlert questioned what work would be necessary. The Mayor stated the work would include writing a new description of each district including the buildings and would also significance of the resource and themes that make it significant. There are very specific guidelines prescribed by the Park Service. This update would provide a more accurate view of the historic significance of the whole village. This designation also helps protect the historic nature of the village, as agencies such as Department of Transportation, have to consider this designation before making any changes. Trustee Lanphear commented it is another layer of protection. Mayor Corby indicated due to the competition for the grant there is a 40% match, which could be phased in through two budget years. Mayor Corby indicated after the grant work was complete the village would have a document, which would be the best history to date about the village. Trustee Boehlert stated this would be a benefit received. We could post it on the website. Village Attorney, Jeff Turner, commented it could lead to some APRB actions in the future. Mayor Corby stated it would also be a matter of pride for the community.

Alysa Plummer, 66 South Main Street: Commented to the Board that this would provide a tremendous reference document for the Boards and the community since it is so detailed.

Justin Vliestra, 19 Boughton Avenue: Informed the Board that the designation might assist residents, with obtaining grants for improvements on their home. He had previously been denied for a grant since he was not with in the district boundary. Mayor Corby commented this would also be a benefit to the commercial buildings as well.

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Board of Trustees  
January 28, 2014

Peggy Brizee, Historic Pittsford: Informed the Board that they were supporting this action. They indicated there would be many benefits to the expansion of the district. She also stated there was a chance she could provide the village with additional financial support, after she spoke to her Board.

Kendra Evans, 21 Boughton Avenue: Questioned if this project would assist residents going in front of the APRB Board. The Board thought the best way for a resident to prepare for appearing in front of the Board is to review the existing design standards and to work with the Building Inspector.

**Motion Trustee Boehlert, seconded by Trustee Lanphear,** to authorize the Mayor to sign the CLG grant paperwork.

**Vote:** Corby – yes, Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried**

**MEMBER ITEMS – Continued**

Trustee Galli discussed with the Board the need to complete employee reviews. Mayor Corby requested the reviews be completed by the last meeting in February.

Trustee Galli expressed concerns with the current energy bill. He is working with a broker to assist the Village in obtaining a new supplier.

Trustee Lanphear questioned what would be the timeline needed to review the issues related to the SEQR for 75 Monroe. The Board stated they should wait for the proposal from Mr. Sciremammano.

**ATTORNEY CLIENT MEETING**

The Board entered an Attorney Client meeting at 8:45 pm

**Motion Trustee Boehlert, seconded by Trustee Lanphear,** to re-enter the regular session of the meeting.

**Vote:** Corby – yes, Galli – yes, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion Mayor Corby, seconded by Trust Lanphear,** to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 pm.

**Vote:** Corby – yes, Galli – abstained, Lanphear– yes, Boehlert – yes, Galusha– yes. **Motion carried.**

---

Dorothea M. Ciccarelli, Recording Secretary