

**ROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING
OF THE
VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Sutherland High School – LGI Room
July 9, 2013 – 7:00 PM**

Present

Trustees:	Lili Lanphear Lorie Boehlert Stacey Freed Tim Galli
Attorney:	Jeffrey Turner
Recording Secretary:	Anne Hartsig
Absent:	Mayor Corby

CALL TO ORDER

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

CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING – 75 MONROE AVENUE

Trustee Galli asked members of the public to turn off all cell phones. He noted that a court recorder was present. He asked members of the public who wish to speak to state their name and address clearly for the record.

Trustee Galli explained that this meeting would begin with a continuation of a public hearing which was opened on July 2, 2013 to consider a request from Pittsford Canalside Properties to modify a regulating plan regarding the proposed development at 75 Monroe Avenue. At that meeting, the Board of Trustees received public comment on the changes and the applicant answered a number of questions and presented clarifications to help the Board and the public understand the proposed changes to the regulating plan. Trustee Galli asked if there were new comments or changes from the previous week.

Peter Vars, BME Associates on behalf of Pittsford Canalside Properties: Mr. Vars began by saying those present would be continuing the discussion of the issues as they relate to a revised regulating plan that has evolved as a result of the preliminary site plan review process over the last 5 months, and the DRC meetings. He noted it was an open process. He said the applicant listened to the outcome of the DRC meetings. Out of respect for the assembled public and the Board of Trustees, at the last meeting, the applicant answered questions and responded to comments about the revised plan. He noted that the majority of those questions and comments were not relevant to the regulating plan request. He said they were issues that were previously discussed, reviewed and considered during the two-year special permit process. He stated that the applicant is not requesting a change to the size of the project. He referred to the chart that was distributed at the July 2nd public that showed the requested changes to the regulating plan. He said the applicant does not believe the requested changes are substantive. Mr. Vars said the applicant is hoping the Board of Trustees will support this amended regulating plan which is a culmination of an extensive and open site plan review process, a process led by the Planning Board, as it should be. He noted that the process has involved several public meetings with the Planning Board, reviews by staff and consultants, as well as the DRC meetings, which consisted of representatives of the Board of Trustees, the PZBA and the APRB. He said the process was taken seriously by the applicant. He asked that the public meeting be closed if there is no new information forthcoming so that the applicant can move forward with the site plan process.

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees
July 9, 2013

Trustee Galli asked if there were any new comments. He said the Board would like to avoid duplication of comments made at the public hearing on July 2nd.

Janet Reynolds – 35 Church Street: Ms. Reynolds said it was her understanding that the roads in the original regulating plan were not the appropriate width per the Fire Marshal. If that is the case, she asked how the original regulating plan could be implemented if the new plan is not approved.

Peter Vars – BME Associates: Mr. Vars answered that the original plan could be implemented. He said the streets along the canal and the railroad would conform to the streetscape design requirements of the R-5 Code. Access for emergency vehicles would be provided on the sides of the buildings. The building at the end would be moved slightly to the north to provide the turn around required by the Fire Marshal.

Chris Linares – South Main Street: Mr. Linares commented that there was 25% green space in the original regulating plan and there is approximately 29% green space shown on the amended plan. He said if the revised plan is rejected, the original plan would go into effect and the Village would give up the additional green space shown on the revised plan.

Peggy Caraberis – 81 South Main Street: Ms. Caraberis spoke on behalf of Historic Pittsford. She read portions of the following letter which was first read to the Planning Board in March 2013.

Dear Ms. Mitchell,

As the review of Westport Crossing site plans gets under way, the Board of Directors of Historic Pittsford offers comments for your consideration during these important deliberations. These are submitted as part of the record of the Planning and Zoning Board of Appeals public hearing to be held on March 25, 2013.

Since the 1960's, Historic Pittsford has advocated for the preservation of our community's important architectural and historic resources. With the assistance of members of Historic Pittsford, the designation of the Village as an historic district was a phenomenal achievement for our Village and the ripple effect of this collaborative effort has enhanced the quality of life of the entire Pittsford community. This preservation effort and others that followed are examples of the commitment, strong advocacy, and dedicated partnership between Historic Pittsford and Pittsford Village officials over many years and numerous issues.

For the Westport Crossing project, a thoughtful and comprehensive Regulating Plan was drafted to guide the applicant and the Village towards a final context-sensitive project with an innovative "canal commercial" design. The Special Use Permit approved by the Board of Trustees defines the Regulating Plan as the "Concept Plan, the Ground Level Drawing, the Quantitative Analysis, and the maximum heights" and clearly stipulates several parameters that include the following: maximum of 167 apartment units; "canal commercial" design; seven apartment buildings with approximately 28% of these being four stories and a two-story building at the Monroe Avenue entrance; streets with streetscape elements including full-sized deciduous trees; the appearance of several larger scale buildings set among smaller and lower structures, and other character-defining elements.

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees
July 9, 2013

A comparison of the Preliminary Site Plans submitted by the developer in the past month and the Regulating Plan indicates major differences in the direction of this project. For example:

- *The 2013 Preliminary Site Plan shows five (rather than seven) apartment buildings for the same 167 residences. Deeper building footprints disallow street level plantings, green space and the walkable residential streetscape anticipated in the Regulating Plan.*
- *A recent Site Plan replaces the two story residential building at the Westport Crossing entrance with a commercial restaurant that was originally to be in the interior of the project to draw the public to the residential area and canal amenities. This change removes the residential focus and pedestrian streetscape from Monroe Avenue as dictated by the Regulating Plan.*
- *The building design did not adhere to the “canal commercial” standards articulated under SEQRA and in the Regulating Plan, but rather used as an example a variation of a complex the Martin Architectural firm had designed in Maryland.*
- *With fewer buildings proposed, more of them can be 4 stories while keeping within the 28% requirement. The new configuration offers less opportunity to reduce the impact of height and mass at the edge of the Village at its most visible and important gateway.*

*The recent site and architectural submissions appear to constitute a new project, less like an evolved residential neighborhood and more like a typical suburban apartment complex. **Due to the significant deviation from the Regulating Plan and as submitted to the Lead Agency and Involved Agencies under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), the Board of Directors of Historic Pittsford strongly urges a re-examination of the altered site plans under both of these rules.***

Please receive these comments in the spirit of cooperation and partnership in which they are offered. The Board of Directors of Historic Pittsford fully supports the Planning and Architectural Review boards in their review of the plans for Westport Crossing. The preservation and context-sensitive changes to Pittsford Village have been a large part of Historic Pittsford’s mission for decades. Together we are stewards of the past and future of a community that can claim a very high level of historic integrity and a willingness to put itself on the cutting edge of preservation.

*Respectively submitted,
Margaret E. Caraberis, President, Historic Pittsford*

Justin Vlietstra – 19 Boughton Avenue: Mr. Vlietstra said he was looking for clarifications made by the developer last week concerning heights. He asked if the heights are different on different sides of the buildings. He asked if the approximate difference is ten feet. Mr. Vars answered that the elevation differences are on the street on the side of the railroad and the street on the side of the canal. Building number #5 is different. Mr. Vlietstra said the canal side needs to be lower so residents and the public can have access to the canal. He said in doing this, it exposes the garage level story of the building. He said the first floor on the canalside is elevated from the street.

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees
July 9, 2013

Frank Pavia – Attorney for Pittsford Canalside Properties: Mr. Pavia stated this has always been the case and is not relevant to the modifications that are before the Board of Trustees for approval.

Mr. Vlietstra asked what the actual heights of the buildings are in feet and stories. **Mr. Vars** replied that as it relates to elevations; both regulating plans are the same.

Attorney Pavia stated the building heights have nothing to do with the modifications in front of the Trustees. **Trustee Galli** added that this appears to be a site plan or APRB issue and the Board is dealing with the regulating plan at present. **Mr. Pavia** said the only question is are the modifications to the regulating plan acceptable? He said the rest of the plan is the same. The modifications include relocating the restaurant, reducing the number of residential units, moving the pool, and changing some of the aesthetics of the buildings which were proposed and requested by the APRB and the Planning Board. He said SEQR, code compliance, and height are all issues that are irrelevant for the purpose of this hearing. The applicant is just seeking approval for the modifications to the regulating plan.

Trustee Freed said that the public wants to know. She said no one has said what the heights will be.

Attorney Pavia responded that during the opening comments, the Deputy Mayor asked that comments be limited to the regulating plan which is a conceptual plan with conceptual design elements. Verification of heights is part of the site plan process.

Peter Vars said a preliminary site plan on file at the Village Hall has a table that notes building heights and number of stories for the revised plan. He said that it shows that the stories and the percentage of stories conform to the conditions of the special permit.

Trustee Freed stated that the Village Code has heights which include the eaves and above but the developer is providing numbers to the eaves. **Mr. Pavia** replied that is because of the way the regulating plan was written. He said it was part of the special permit issued by the Board of Trustees. It overrides the Code. He said a special permit is pursuant to Article V A. of the Village Code. **Trustee Freed** said she does not think this meets with the Code and she finds this to be an issue.

Justin Vlietstra continued with his comments. He asked if a parking garage is considered a story. He said a basement is included as a story per the Village Code. He said according to the Village Code you can have a cellar or a basement underneath a first floor. Regarding a basement, less than half of the wall is exposed. A cellar is more than half exposed. He said he is bringing the point up because a basement is included as a story per the Village Code but a cellar is not. He said it is a question of whether either of the regulating plans actually meets the Code.

Attorney Turner responded that the first plan was approved with the same grades. He said the question is irrelevant because it has been answered by the special use permit. **Mr. Vlietstra** argued that the special permit doesn't have heights. **Attorney Turner** replied that it does. It has stories. **Mr. Vlietstra** commented that it is his understanding that the applicant and the Board of Trustees refuses to answer the question of what the height of the buildings are. He said he concludes that almost the entire parking garage is exposed so the entire site has four stories, which is not legal.

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees
July 9, 2013

Paul Zachman, Chairman of the APRB: Mr. Zachman explained that when reviewing the heights for the special permit, there were a number of feet for living space, and a number of feet for utilities. He said they purposely defined the height of the buildings to the eaves so that the APRB could have purview over roof pitches and architectural features. They felt it would be too limiting from a design standpoint to regulate ridge heights so they went to the eaves line. He said it is clearly outlined in the resolution.

Fran Kramer, 17 Golf Avenue: Ms. Kramer said it was helpful to have the comparison document prepared by Mr. Steinmetz. She asked if the dead end terminus fits in with the Fire Code. It was explained that the change was dictated by the Fire Marshal. The explanation regarding how the street widths in the original regulating plan will be allowed was repeated.

Mike Reynolds, 35 Church Street: Mr. Reynolds asked how a plan with no dimensions can be called a regulating plan. He said it is like a sketch on a napkin. He said the Planning Board can't tell what has changed from the original plan to the revised plan because there are no building or street dimensions.

Peter Vars said all of this evolved as a result of a preliminary site plan. He repeated that preliminary site plans are on file at the Village Hall. He said they are scaled drawings and everything has dimensions. He repeated that it was the Planning Board process that led to the DRC process which led to the modified regulating plan. He said all of the information is in the Village Hall.

Eric Bond, 427 Stone Road: Mr. Bond said he was President of Village Green. He asked if the applicant would have to refile in order to execute the original plan. **Peter Vars** answered that the resolution issuing the special permit gives leeway to the site plan design to accommodate the New York State Fire Code. He said the revised regulating plan is being driven by the Fire Code and not by the applicant. Reasonable changes can be expected because the regulating plan is a conceptual plan.

Peggy Caraberis stated that in the revised plan the buildings are deeper. She asked if that was to accommodate the underground parking. **Peter Vars** replied that underground parking would still be provided in the original plan but it would not be as efficient. He said the total number of parking places would remain the same.

Alysa Plummer, 66 South Main Street: Ms. Plummer asked if all of the questions from the July 2nd hearing had been answered. As a result, **Attorney Turner** read and answered questions that Trustee Freed had written from the last meeting. **Ms. Plummer** thought some questions had not yet been answered. She asked if questions that were not relevant to the regulating plan hearing would ever be answered in another meeting or venue. **Attorney Turner** replied that if the questions are relevant to the proceedings, they will be addressed and answered. **Trustee Lanphear** asked if the other Boards are required to answer questions or if only the Trustees are required to answer. **Attorney Turner** replied that the Planning Board requires a public hearing and public input will be heard. He said as a normal course, the APRB hears from the public. **Ms. Plummer** said questions the public is asking are not odd ball questions and are relevant to the project. For example, she asked how the public can know that the heights are the same if the drawings are only conceptual. **Attorney Turner** replied that Mr. Vars said the heights are clearly set out on the site plan submitted to the Village Office. He said that the public also heard from Mr. Zachman that the roof line was purposely left open. Therefore those dimensions cannot be known at this time. He said it is part of an evolving process in terms of how the APRB deals with the treatment of the roof lines. Ms. Plummer commented that when the Village engages their

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees
July 9, 2013

board members in absolute collaboration with the applicant for so long, it has the appearance that they become stakeholders in the outcome. She said the DRC is supposed to be an internal process and it appears to have been hijacked. She said board members shouldn't be engaging the applicant and the applicant shouldn't be helping the DRC to write a memorandum. **Trustee Boehlert** said the Board could keep a list of the questions in the Village Office and could post the answers. **Ms. Plummer** said the board should do anything to keep things open and transparent. She said the public doesn't really know what will be built there. Having only conceptual documents for four years is very frustrating.

Trustee Galli commented there has been considerable push back on the applicant in terms of "we don't like..., we don't like..." He emphasized that there is no partnership between the Board of Trustees and the applicant regarding this project.

Jean Moe (address unknown): Ms. Moe stated as an observer it clearly feels like the Board is a partner with the applicant. She said the words, body language, and atmosphere in the room make it feel that way.

Mike Reynolds, 35 Church Street: Mr. Reynolds said questions about SEQR raised at the last meeting were not addressed. He stated that the law requires that the request to modify the regulating plan be tabled until a new SEQR review is done. He asked the Board to address this issue and asked if it is true or not.

Attorney Turner responded that the appropriate process is to gather all the facts, which is happening in the context of the public hearing. Once the public hearing is closed, the Board will determine if there have been substantive changes to the plan. If the answer is yes, they will look at whether or not the changes have environmental impacts that are potentially large and that have not been reviewed under the old SEQR process. When that process is concluded, the Board will consider the changes requested by the applicant in light of the requirements of the R-5 Code. They will prepare a resolution that finds whether or not they are going to adopt a new regulating plan. If SEQR is going to be reopened, this is not the appropriate time to do it. The Board will have to decide whether to rescind the first SEQR. **Ms. Plummer** asked when the appropriate time is. **Attorney Turner** answered in the process of determining whether or not there is an adverse environmental impact that is potentially large, and one that was not considered in the first SEQR, the Board will have to decide whether to rescind its negative declaration. This will happen prior to a decision with regard to the request to modify the regulating plan.

Attorney Pavia said the applicant anticipates after closing the public hearing, the Board will consider if the changes are substantive in nature and scope requiring that either the negative declaration be amended or rescinded. If not substantive in nature, no further SEQR deliberation is required. If the Board does determine the changes are substantive, they still need to determine if the changes rise to the level of presenting a new, potentially significant adverse environmental impact that has not already been addressed by the prior negative declaration. The applicant expects that the Board will do this analysis before it votes on the actual modifications to the regulating plan.

Peggy Caraberis: Ms. Caraberis asked if it is within the Trustees' jurisdiction to come up with another regulating plan. **Attorney Turner** replied the R-5 Code permits the Board to establish a regulating plan for properties in the R-5 district. He suggested that the Board of Trustees doesn't have the capacity or ability to design a project. He said it probably wouldn't be within its jurisdiction to proactively propose a regulating plan that has not been requested. **Trustee**

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees
July 9, 2013

Lanphear said the Board can ask for changes in the regulating plan to which **Attorney Turner** replied that the fine tuning will occur in the Planning Board and APRB processes.

Chris Linares: Mr. Linares asked if the Board of Trustees can suggest a change to the regulating plan at some point in time after the applicant has worked with the Planning Board, APRB, fire marshal and every other agency, after the applicant has absorbed all of the recommendations and after approval has been given by the members and chairs of those boards to get to this revised regulating plan? **Attorney Turner** replied that a regulating plan may be established by the Trustees. However, if the Board does something outrageous, the Village will be sued because they have acted in an arbitrary and capricious manner.

Don Riley, Mark IV Enterprises: Mr. Riley commented that after the Board of Trustees spent 2-3 years, beginning with the annexation, they wanted to make sure all of their efforts weren't lost when the project went to the Planning Board so they put a regulating plan in the resolution. They did this to give direction to the Planning Board and APRB without strictures, to make sure the Planning Board knew exactly what the Trustees and the public wanted to see on that site. He said there is reluctance because the Village is being sued. Their decision is being challenged so they have to be mindful. The process has been open, there are no secrets. There are no facts that differ board to board. Mr. Riley explained the circumstances of a Mark IV application withdrawal in Irondequoit.

Eric Bond: Mr. Bond asked if the circumstances surrounding the waste water pipe that goes through the project would be significant enough to reopen SEQR. It was clarified that the pipe is a storm water pipe, not a wastewater pipe. **Trustee Galli** said the applicant will address this as part of the site plan review. **Attorney Turner** said the Board will look to see if this new information regarding that pipe is a substantive change. It has been draining there before the project and the applicant said it will drain again. That is the context at which they will review whether or not it is a substantive issue.

Alan Knauf, Attorney representing the Friends of Pittsford: Mr. Knauf said the regulations state at any time prior to the decision, the lead agency must rescind a negative declaration if the information changes or if there is new information. That would include if there is incorrect information on the original environmental form such as different heights. He said it encompasses new information and it is mandatory.

Justin Vlietstra: Mr. Vlietstra asked if his questions regarding three or four stories based on the parking garage level will be answered. **Attorney Turner** responded that it will be looked at by the Planning Board. **Paul Zachman** said the answer is in the resolution. He read the description of two, three, and four story buildings. He said it is pretty clear. **Mr. Vlietstra** countered it does not tell you what the story height is.

Attorney Pavia asked the Board to close the public hearing if there are no more public comments in respect to the revised regulating plan.

Peggy Caraberis: Ms. Caraberis said after the special permit was approved following 3-4 years of work, it didn't take the developer much time to come in with a changed plan. She said those assembled are talking tonight about a variation of the plan the developer came in with. She said a lot of work has been done and it is important to do this right.

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees
July 9, 2013

Trustee Galli said the DRC reviewed the changes and the committee was in support of the changes per their memorandum. **Trustee Lanphear**, a member of the DRC, said she was not in favor of it.

George Wallace 7 Village Grove: Mr. Wallace was also a member of the DRC. He said the memo was drawn up by Paul Zachman and Mayor Corby. He said members of the DRC included Trustee Lanphear who had ample time and opportunity to object. He said she did not object either at meetings or subsequently as the memorandum was being circulated. **Trustee Lanphear** replied that she did object and had sent emails stating her objection. There was a brief discussion about the content of the emails. Mr. Wallace said he received only one email, and it was regarding the definition of the word “endorsement”.

Trustee Galli asked if there were additional public comments. Hearing none, he indicated that Mayor Corby had mentioned in a conversation earlier in the day that he was in agreement that the public hearing should be closed if there are no additional comments about the proposed changes. Accordingly, **Trustee Galli** made a **motion, seconded by Trustee Boehlert**, to close the public hearing.

Vote: Galli – yes, Boehlert – yes, Lanphear – no, Freed – no. **Motion denied.**

Trustee Galli announced that the public hearing would be continued on July 23rd at 7 PM at Sutherland High School in the LGI Room. He thanked the public for their input and said it is not lost on the Board members.

PITTSFORD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE – REQUEST FOR NON-MUNICIPAL USE PERMIT

Lisa Ford, a business development officer, addressed the Board of Trustees to request a non-municipal use permit to hold an event on August 6, 2013 in the village to celebrate the PGA. She explained that the event would be similar to Candlelight Night and would give exposure to the retailers within the village. She said she would like to have music and she would like to place an information tent on the Michaels property at the Four Corners. Code Enforcement Officer John Limbeck explained the requirements found in §176-29. “Authorization of nonmunicipal use; permit application”, of the Village Code. A discussion regarding the plans for this event was held. The Board of Trustees agreed that the details for this event still need to be flushed out. It was the consensus of the Board to waive the requirement for submission of an application 45 days in advance of the event. Ms. Ford will work with Mr. Limbeck to submit a complete application.

TREASURER’S REPORT – TRUSTEE GALLI

Trustee Galli presented vouchers listed on Abstract #003 of 2013/14 fiscal year for approval. The abstract was prepared by Treasurer Mary Marowski. Noting that he had reviewed the bills, **Trustee Galli** made a **motion, seconded by Trustee Boehlert**, to approve payment of vouchers listed on Abstract #003 in the amounts stated below and to charge them to the appropriate accounts

Abstract #003 – 2013/14

General Fund (#32-#48, #50-#63):	\$10,001.65
Sewer Fund (#49, #56)	<u>\$ 2,742.05</u>
Total vouchers for approval:	\$12,743.70

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

BUILDING INSPECTOR’S REPORT – JOHN LIMBECK

Mr. Limbeck reported the following:

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees
July 9, 2013

- A meeting with Charles Fox is being rescheduled.
- Mr. Limbeck is awaiting the outcome of a discussion between Mayor Corby and Attorney Turner regarding sign requests for municipal uses from the Town of Pittsford.
- St. Louis submitted drawings to renovate restrooms in Reddington Hall. Asbestos was discovered. The Village will need to have documentation showing that the New York State Building Code has been followed regarding asbestos removal to protect both the school and the Village. Mr. Limbeck will ask St. Louis representatives for a remediation plan.
- Simply Crepes on Schoen Place is contemplating expanding their space in to the jewelry store next door. Mr. Limbeck will review the building code and Kelly Cline will check on fire code issues.

KCI Proposal: Mr. Limbeck resubmitted the proposal from KCI for a dedicated Code Enforcement Officer for the 75 Monroe Avenue project. It was clarified that Mr. Limbeck would have to issue all building permits as the building inspector on review of the site plans.

Attorney Turner said this proposal is not covered under the present escrow agreement with Mark IV. He said the proposal would be sent to Attorney Pavia to ask for a new escrow agreement. If approved, Attorney Turner will draft a letter to be sent to Attorney Pavia.

A **motion** was made **by Trustee Boehlert, seconded by Trustee Galli**, to accept KCI's proposal for a dedicated Code Enforcement Officer in regards to the development project at 75 Monroe Avenue.

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

MEMBER ITEMS

- Trustee Lanphear led a discussion about illegal signs in the Village right of way. Board members agreed that any of the Trustees could remove illegal signs from the right of way. Mr. Limbeck will research stickers that can be placed on signs that have received a permit.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

A **motion** was made **by Trustee Galli, seconded by Trustee Boehlert**, to enter executive session to discuss the employment history of a specific individual.

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

Having taken no action, a **motion** was made **by Trustee Boehlert, seconded by Trustee Freed**, to leave executive session.

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

ATTORNEY/CLIENT PRIVATE MEETING

A **motion** was made **by Trustee Boehlert, seconded by Trustee Galli**, to hold a private meeting with Attorney Turner for purposes of legal advice.

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

Having taken no action, a **motion** was made **by Trustee Boehlert, seconded by Trustee Galli**, to leave the private meeting and resume proceedings of the regular meeting.

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

NYPIRG SUMMER OUTREACH PROGRAM

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees
July 9, 2013

The Village Board received notification that NYPIRG (New York Public Interest Research Group) will be conducting a door to door community outreach in the Village between July 1 and August 9th. The Clerk will acknowledge the request in writing and ask that the group refrain from going door to door after 8 PM.

DPW REPORT

On behalf of the Superintendent, Trustee Boehlert reported the following:

- The Public Works department received new shirts that have reflective tape sewn on them. This eliminates the need for safety vests in the summer.
- There is a diseased Village tree at 41 Courtenay Circle. Jim Edwards will look at the tree. A quote for the cost of removal will be requested.
- A tree at Sutherland and Lincoln is scheduled to be removed.
- Two trees in front of 45 Monroe Avenue will be removed by Terry Trees. Terry Trees has the State bid so the cost is considerably less. Terry Trees works primarily on State owned roads. Trustee Lanphear said the matter should be deferred to Mayor Corby since he is the Trustee in charge of trees.
- Schoen Place is scheduled for slurry sealing. The job has been postponed twice due to weather conditions. Bristol's is scheduled to complete the Schoen Place landscaping during the week of July 15th. It is hoped that the road work will be finished prior to the landscaping.
- The new-to-us truck purchased from the Town is being outfitted with a back-up camera.
- DPW Crew member Sophie Bennett has been cleared to return to work following her injury. She will report to work on July 15th.
- Six catch basins have been repaired. Four more are in need.
- Weeding, mowing and other landscaping jobs are back logged due to Ms. Bennett's absence.

REQUEST FROM THE AMERICAN LEGION POST

The Board received a request from the American Legion Post for access to the main floor restroom on the evenings they will be using the JCO Board Room. Board members agreed to accommodate the Veterans because they are already tenants of the building. Jef Mason agreed to take responsibility for the group.

MINUTES

June 11, 2013 – Special Meeting: A motion was made by Trustee Boehlert, seconded by Trustee Freed, to approve these minutes as presented.

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

June 25, 2013 – Regular Meeting: A motion was made by Trustee Galli, seconded by Trustee Lanphear, to approve these minutes as presented.

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

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a motion was made by Trustee Galli, seconded by Trustee Boehlert, to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 PM.

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

Proceedings of a Meeting of the Village of Pittsford Board of Trustees
July 9, 2013

Anne Z. Hartsig, Recording Secretary