

**PROCEEDINGS OF A SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
June 14, 2012 – 6:00 PM**

Present

Mayor: Robert C. Corby

Trustees: Lorie Boehlert

Trip Pierson

Tim Galli

SEQR Process Advisor: Art Ientilucci

Recording Secretary: Anne Hartsig

CALL TO ORDER:

Mayor Corby made a motion, seconded by Trustee Boehlert to call the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

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

PURPOSE: Mayor Corby explained that the purpose of this meeting was to review the status of the environmental review process with respect to the proposed development at 75 Monroe Avenue and to hear public comment regarding the SEQR process.

Mr. Ientilucci explained the purpose of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). He said that the Board of Trustees, as Lead Agency, must consider the environmental impacts of any actions that are taken by the APRB, the PZBA, or their own Board. They must do this early in the review process. He said the goal is to avoid or limit any negative environmental impacts.

Mr. Ientilucci explained that the steps for the basic SEQR review process are as follows: determine that an action is subject to SEQR; classify the action; identify agencies that are interested and/or involved; select a lead agency for Type 1 Actions; conduct an environmental review; make a significance determination.

Mr. Ientilucci explained how SEQR applies to the proposed development at 75 Monroe Avenue. He said the Village received an application for a special permit for multi family housing and for a restaurant both of which are to be located at 75 Monroe Avenue. Special permits require approval from the Board of Trustees. Approvals will also be needed from the PZBA, the APRB, and several State agencies such as the New York State Canal Corporation. The proposed development was classified as a Type 1 Action, requiring a coordinated review. The Village Board of Trustees was designated as the lead agency and will assess the environmental impacts and eventually make a significance determination. He noted that the completion of the SEQR process does not signify approval of the application. Mr. Ientilucci continued by explaining the difference between a Negative Declaration and a Positive Declaration.

STATUS: The Village Board has completed Part 2 of the full EAF and discussed the magnitude of impacts in the different categories. They have also completed a first draft of Part 3.

PROJECT SPONSOR PRESENTATION OF CURRENT PLANS:

Chris DiMarzo explained the transformation of this project from 2008 to the present time. He highlighted many changes that have taken place since the project was first introduced. It was

Proceedings of a Special Meeting of the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees
June 14, 2012

noted that the applicant has made many of these changes at the suggestion of the various village boards.

RECEIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENT:

Frank Galusha, 24 Boughton Avenue had the following questions.

Regarding the *Impact on the Growth and Character of the Community or Neighborhood*, Mr. Galusha asked why the Board has considered the proposed project to have only a “small to moderate” impact in regards to setting an important precedent for future projects. Mayor Corby explained that other areas of the village are not zoned for a project of this density. It was noted that if an impact is deemed to be “small to moderate”, it does not require the completion of Part 3. However, the Village Board completed Part 3 in order to fully investigate each of the impacts listed in Part 2.

Regarding the proposal to have approximately 1/3 one bedroom units, 1/3 two bedroom units and 1/3 three bedroom units, Mr. DiMarzo said he is conducting on going demographic studies and has had an incredible response. Mr. Galusha asked if the Board has seen a demographic study. Mayor Corby responded that the Board studied the financial information regarding this project about a year ago.

Mr. Galusha said the height of the buildings is being listed at plus or minus forty feet. He wondered what the plus side might be. Mr. DiMarzo said the buildings would be varied with two, three and four stories. Mayor Corby explained that the APRB and the PZBA have worked with the applicant regarding the height distribution on the site. Less than 25% of the project will be four stories high. The applicant and the boards looked at what views are most important and they looked at ways to mitigate the building height concern. Many improvements and enhancements have been made to the project to make it feel more like a village street. Mr. Galusha asked if the plus or minus forty feet could be more specifically defined. Mayor Corby said that if the Board of Trustees issues a special permit, they have the ability to set conditions which could include a condition about height.

Mr. Galusha asked if the traffic study of February 2011 has been updated. He asked if the board is comfortable with the impact the project will have on traffic. Mayor Corby responded that this project will generate the same amount of traffic as the smallest apartment complex on Monroe Avenue. He said the biggest issue is the speed of the traffic. Mayor Corby has another meeting scheduled with SRF Associates. He said the main reason the area was rezoned to residential is because it will generate only a fraction of the amount of traffic that a commercial use would generate. Attorney Essler added that the proposed project is a stimulus to talk to the DOT about improvements such as a median on the west side of the bridge.

Mr. Galusha asked if the Board is comfortable that this project will fit in with the character of the village. Mayor Corby replied that the boards have actively worked with the applicant and positive changes have been made. He said the Boards want it to look like it could have naturally evolved on this site. Trustee Pierson said he is pleased with the direction the project is going. Mayor Corby noted that the environmental review has raised issues with the applicant and has had a positive impact on the give and take.

Mr. Galusha asked if changes are made in the future, such as changing the project from three bedroom units to one bedroom units, would the changes have to be approved by the Planning Board. The answer was yes.

Proceedings of a Special Meeting of the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees
June 14, 2012

Mr. Galusha asked about drainage and any potential impact to Long Meadow residents. Mayor Corby explained that there will be a subsurface system whereby the water will go into the soil. In extreme conditions, it would flow into the Canal. The Canal flows west to east so the water would not impact Long Meadow residents.

Mr. Galusha asked if the project will impact the sewer system. The response was yes, it will. It would require the sewer pipe to have increased capacity. A larger pipe would be installed on Sutherland Street.

Mr. Galusha asked how this property would be taxed. Attorney Essler said if the village budget remains essentially the same, taxes of other property owners in the village may go down somewhat. He said depending on what the village budget is taxes can still vary. Regardless, this project will add taxable value to the land in the village.

There was no one else in attendance who wished to speak about this project.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a **motion** was made **by Mayor Corby, seconded by Trustee Galli**, to adjourn the meeting at 6:55 PM.

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

Anne Z. Hartsig, Recording Secretary