

**TOWN OF PITTSFORD  
PLANNING BOARD  
October 26, 2020**

Minutes of the Town of Pittsford Planning Board meeting held on October 26, 2020 at 6:00 pm local time. The Meeting took place with Board members participating remotely using Zoom.

**PRESENT:** Kevin Morabito, Paula Liebschutz, Jeffrey Donlon, John Halldow

**ABSENT:** Dave Jefferson, John Limbeck, Sarah Gibson

**ALSO PRESENT:** Kate Munzinger, Town Board Liaison, Robert Koegel, Town Attorney, Douglas DeRue, Director of Planning, Zoning & Development, Jessica Yaeger, Planning Board Secretary

**ATTENDANCE:** There were 30 members of the public present.

Vice Chair Donlon made a motion to call the meeting to order seconded by Board Member Liebschutz. Following a unanimous voice vote the meeting opened at 6:06 P.M.

**DECISION PENDING:**

**Bridleridge Subdivision**, Section 2, Final Subdivision Approval

Board Member Liebschutz recused herself from the application.

Fred Shelley from BME Associates as agent for Bridleridge Farms Subdivision spoke on behalf of the application. He thanked the Board for hearing the application and gave a brief update on the status of the project. BME has provided comments to the Conditions of Approval in their Preliminary Approval received 7/13/20, as well as well as comments regarding Storm Water plans with Town Staff. He also noted that he received a Final Review Letter from the Town and will work with the Town to complete those.

Vice Chair Donlon referenced the Final Review Letter and the number of comments the Town had made that needed to be addressed to make sure the applicant was aware and okay with them. Fred Shelley responded yes.

Unfortunately with Board Member Liebschutz's recusal, there was not enough board members present for a Quorum. The applicant will come back on the next Planning Board meeting scheduled for 11/9/20..

Town Attorney Robert Koegel made note of a correction to be made in the Draft Final Resolution for Bridleridge Farms Section 2. Under the Conditions of Approval, the 3<sup>rd</sup> condition noted "final engineering plan review comments dated 10/22/20." The correct date should read 10/21/20. The Planning Board Secretary Jessica Yaeger made note and will edit the Draft for the following meeting.

**NEW HEARING:**

**Oak Hill Country Club, Final Site Plan and Special Use Permit**

Jim McKenna and Jim Durfee and Brian Burri from Bergmann were in attendance on behalf of the application.

Mr. McKenna introduced the concept for the project, with the construction of two (2) cottages providing overnight accommodations to members and their guests. This concept is something that has become more common in the Top 100 golf courses in the United States. It is also something that has previously existed at Oak Hill Country Club, where guest accommodations previously existed in the Club House until it was remodeled into other uses. Oak Hill Country Club has spent time with their membership and neighboring residents regarding the project and resolving any major concerns they may have. They have received majority support from their membership and have addressed any neighboring property concerns.

Brian Burri with Bergmann used screen share to explain the details of the proposed cottages. Jim Durfee reviewed the project location which will front Chapin Way (the club's main entrance drive), immediately adjacent to the Knollwood neighborhood to the North, east of the tennis courts. He explained that the cottages are designed in a "Tudor Revival" style as they tried to stay close to the main Club House's architecture. They took great care in the design and look of the cottages as they will be seen before the club house is as you enter the main drive. Both cottages will be 3,800 square feet and include 8 rooms that can be rented as a whole, or separately which will give the club flexibility in utilizing the cottages as accommodations. Jim Durfee did note that the plan is now proposing 3 cottages, down from the originally proposed 4 cottages (2 of which are being constructed now, the remaining cottage will be a future Planning Board submittal).

Brian Burri reviewed the Site Plan for the Cottages, where he discussed that the proposed location of the cottages are 210 feet to the nearest residential property. They have spoken with the owner of that property of the proposed plan and any concerns the property owner may have. They have discussed implementing a 3 foot berm with plantings which will give said property 100% screening year round. They are planning to do a selective clearing of trees, and would like to maintain the same Stormwater drainage pattern that is implemented now where the runoff will drain to the South. For the Sanitary Sewers, their intent is to extend a gravity main to Knollwood Dr. and tie into the manholes there. He summarized that they have reviewed the DRC Comments from Town Staff and will be addressing them with a written reply soon.

Vice Chair Donlon asked if there was a lighting plan for the cottages and mentioned potential spill over to neighbors boarding the club property.

Brian Burri replied that they are not proposing any street lighting. Their intent is to use simple residential lighting for each cottage. They may have a (residentially scaled) post lamp for the turnoff areas pulling into the Cottage's parking area, which they will shield if necessary. Each cottage has a porch which will provide sufficient lighting for the accommodations.

Board Member Liebschutz asked for details regarding the tree removal required for the project such as what trees are proposed to be removed, how many trees, and the size.

Jim Durfee responded that they could provide pictures. The trees being removed are not considered high quality or high level trees, many are at the end of life. He estimated about 20 trees would be removed but would get an accurate count for the Board.

Board Member Halldow asked if the Club would have any issues with the Board driving up to take a look at the proposed space for the cottages.

Jim McKenna answered that he would be happy to meet any Board Members for a site visit or to give them a tour.

Board Member Halldow asked about the size of the cottages. Mr. Durfee mentioned the cottages would be 3,800 square feet, but the submittal application noted 5,000 square feet each. Jim McKenna explained that they haven't decided if they are going to do a basement. 3,800 square foot measurement accounts for all of the square footage for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floors of each cottage.

Vice Chair Donlon asked for some clarification on the drainage plan. Brian Burri with Bergmann replied that they would have to raise the height to use the bio-retention area that the Town suggested in the DRC report. They do not want to raise the height of the cottages, therefore they would like to keep the current drainage plan where runoff drains to the South. He is looking to provide the Town with documentation on the exact current drainage levels as compared to the drainage levels they will have with the cottages constructed.

Vice Chair Donlon asked if there were any other questions from the Board or Town Staff.

Doug DeRue, the Director of Planning and Zoning for the Town of Pittsford noted that he would send a picture of the trees proposed to be removed for the cottages to the Board.

Seeing no other questions, Vice Chair Donlon motioned to open the public hearing, seconded by Board Member Morabito and followed by unanimous voice vote.

Vice Chair Donlon noted that Town Staff had received a resident comment dated 10/19/20 from Anthony Dimarco, voicing his strong support for the project.

Vice Chair Donlon then asked if anyone attending the virtual meeting wished to make a comment. Jessica Yaeger, Planning Board Secretary noted that there were no "hands raised" for public comment. Vice Chair Donlon noted that the public hearing would remain open. The applicant was scheduled for a hearing with the Zoning Board of Appeals for a height variance on November 16<sup>th</sup>. DRC Comments should be submitted to the Town for review.

### **Kilbourn Place Apartments**, Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Preliminary/Final Site Plan Approval

Jerry Goldman of Woods Oviatt Gilman LLP, spoke on behalf of the application. Jerry Watkins and Dave Reidman with Reidman Development Corporation, Dave Hanlon and Jared Coon with Hanlon Architects, and Alex Amering with Costich Engineering were also in attendance on behalf of the application.

Jerry Goldman started with a brief history of the project which has been in various stages of development since 2008 with the Town. A Townhouse project proposal was brought before the

Town Board for 3536 East Avenue, which was refined in 2009 and was approved. Fast-forwarding to 2018, Reidman Development Corporation made an application for the current proposal which includes the construction of apartment units at the location of 3500 and 3536 East Ave. Jerry Goldman then went over the overall site plan for the application, detailing a 62-unit apartment building at the north east corner, and a 34 unit apartment building at the far western end. In the middle area there are some town houses and carriage houses. Lot 1 contains the apartment building on the east, and Lot 2 contains the second apartment building to the west which is the former Back Nine Restaurant property, noting that this will take the property from commercial use to residential use. With their Preliminary/Final Planning Board application, they have made some changes from the Town Board application to address some issues to further articulate the site. Jerry Goldman noted the amount of work done at the Town Board level specifically dealing with the apartment building to the west. Concerns from the Town Board and residents dealt with the height of the building originally proposed as 3-stories, and the massing of the building. This resulted in the building create a building with very small frontage to East Ave with the 2 wings and central court yard which reduced the building massing, and decreased to 2-stories. The eastern building was redesigned to be more conforming with the other apartment building. The existing buildings and proposed buildings are shaded light brown and dark brown on the plans to distinguish. Jerry Goldman noted that the Town Staff requested an overlay of the final plans approved by the Town Board to compare with the plans that were submitted for this application. Changes made were to try to maintain some contiguous green area along East Avenue. Minor changes were made in the driveway area, eliminating 2 parking spaces in the front so to not be directly opposite of the residential property the boarders that side of the lot. They do have room as suggested by Town Staff to buffer along West property line. They are also prepared to put in fencing along the West property line as well as berming but is not noted on the plans. With the incentive zoning granted by the Town Board, the property set backs were carried over to site plan so the application does not need any variances. Jerry Goldman noted that they would be responding to Town Staff comments in the Preliminary DRC report in writing.

Dave Hanlon with Hanlon Architecture discussed the elevations provided that show the overall scale, massing, and general character of the buildings. They are preparing 3-D renderings for review as well. He went on to discuss the traditional architectural approach to the buildings, which was meant to mirror what exists on East Avenue. Both buildings have a court yard approach which created an east and west wing for both buildings and reduced frontage for each apartment building along East Avenue as well. The middle units on each apartment building sits 100-125 feet back from the front of the east and west wings behind the centrally landscaped courtyards. This contrasts the original proposal to Town Board where the long façade of the apartment building fronted East Avenue. The proposed garage units are also facing away from East Avenue as well. This keeps a lot of the greenage central to East Avenue. The Carriage House and Town House units will keep similar scale and size to what is already there. The Wright House façade will be restored as part of the incentive zoning as well.

Alex Amerig, Civil Site Engineer for the application, began by showing pictures of the current Town Home design that exist and the site location.

Vice Chair Donlon asked how different the exiting Town Home looks compared to what the apartment buildings will look when constructed. Dave Hanlon, project Architect, answered that The Town Homes are set up as side-by-side arrangements where the apartment buildings are designed to look more like the carriage houses. The designs are meant to be complimentary to each other. Vice Chair Donlon asked if they had been before the Design Review Board yet for this proposal. Dave Hanlon answered that they are submitting next week for the next hearing.

Vice Chair Donlon offered a suggestion that in his opinion, the carriage house design fits in more with the residential look on East Avenue more than the Town Home design. He feels like the apartment buildings should follow the design of the carriage houses over the Town Homes. Dave Reidman noted that the styles of the Town Homes on East Avenue area mix of Manor Homes, Carriage Homes, and Town Homes as their intent is to not have a monolithic look to the overall project. Vice Chair Donlon explained that in his opinion he wouldn't want to see a lot of the "Town Home" look for the project. Dave Reidman and Dave Hanlon said they are open to further discussion depending on the Design Review Board comments they receive.

Vice Chair Donlon added that he thinks the apartment unit courtyards facing East Avenue and the elevation changes are a positive change to the project

Alex Amering continued to explain the civil engineering aspects of the project. A common theme for the landscaping, lighting and stormwater are consistent with original project approval from 2018. The majority of the infrastructure was installed in 2013 including the roadways, sewer, water and stormwater for the full buildout except for the Back Nine Parcel. A Stormwater expansion area was included in this current proposal to include the Back Nine Parcel, subject to Chapter 9 redevelopment criteria through the DEC. A large portion of this area exists today as a parking lot area, but under the current proposal will be piping water to the basins. They have utilized dry basins in the area which holds no water except for during storm events. They have very favorable infiltration rates on this particular site and allows the owner to keep the area well maintained. All stormwater is handled through perforated pipes and open basins where all the water infiltrates into the ground. There are overflow structures in the case of a very large storm event. The Town Homes and Carriage Homes will be constructed with previously approved landscaped plans. A few different plant species updated on the Towns list from the original approval have been updated with their current landscape plan. Mr. Amering recognized the importance of buffering on certain residential areas of the site, particularly on the east and west ends of the site. The use of mature trees, berming and privacy fencing will be used to do this. For the proposed lighting, a photometric plan was submitted and shielding is used when facing property lines. They are using a 13 ft. mounting lighting to mirror subdivision lighting over commercial lighting. For water and sewer notes, going from "for sale" units to rental units makes both the water and sewer private. Currently, water is owned by MCWA and sewers owned by the Town of Pittsford. The water and sewer will now be owned and maintained privately by the project application, similar to the sanitary sewer.

Jerry Goldman ended the applicant presentation wrapping up with the comment that this application has received much site plan scrutiny through the Town Board approval process and that the Planning Board application process will focus on utility connections, grading, lighting and landscaping. He feels like a lot of the elements has been outlined by the Town Board. He also noted that they have received County Planning comments in which they have no problems with any of the comments. There are no issues that affect any negative environmental impact so they are hoping to receive a negative declaration for SEQRA as well. He noted a staff comment regarding parking and that they have more than recommended by Town Board which he feels reflects the number of units and appropriate usage of parking for the project. He made the applicants available for any questions and stated they will note any public comment they receive.

Vice Chair Donlon thanked the applicant for the presentation. He asked how many trees on the landscaping plans are exiting and will provide screening from East Avenue from Day 1?

Dave Reidman replied that the light green outlines on the plan designate existing trees, and the dark green outlines designate proposed plantings. Most of the existing mature trees will remain intact. He also noted that part of the original Kilbourn Place Town Home approval revolved around a Tree Survey that was done.

Vice Chair Donlon asked if it was possible to do a simulation of East Avenue to provide an idea of the screening of the apartments with the existing trees currently. Dave Reidman replied yes.

Vice Chair Donlon also asked about the Preliminary DRC comment #7 concerning the installation of a sidewalk. Dave Reidman answered that the white markings shown on the Overall Site Plan mark the sidewalk along East Avenue which sits behind an architectural wall, which runs to the entrance and then back into the complex.

Vice Chair Donlon also asked if the applicant has spoken with NYS DOT about a signal at the entrance. Dave Reidman replied there is already a signal there which is a four-way stop.

Vice Chair Donlon inquired about the target market for the apartments. Dave Reidman replied that their target market is mainly young retirees and empty nesters (55+), and young professionals. These units are built, designed and targeted for the 55+ population in the Town of Pittsford seeking more of a "lock and go" lifestyle.

The applicant have had quite a bit of conversation with the Town Board regarding this subject,

Jerry Goldman added that although their target market is 55+ this is not a senior living project. These units are market rate, with some smaller units to accommodate different income levels.

Board Member Morabito asked for clarification on Jerry's comment regarding small units to accommodate different income levels. Jerry explained that through the Town Board approval process, there was much discussion about the prospect of affordable housing. There is no affordable housing component to this project, but as a part of the discussion with the Town Board, Mr. Reidman indicated there will be some units that will be smaller in size that will carry a lower price point correlated with the size. Dave Reidman added that they project price points to start at \$1,400/month going up to \$3,000/month for the apartment units. For the newer "legacy" Town Homes and Carriage Homes, the prices are projected to be \$4,000/month at up.

Vice Chair Donlon asked how garbage collection is taking place with the applicant mentioning no outside garbage dumpsters. Dave Reidman answered that there will be trash compactor rooms located on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor. The 2<sup>nd</sup> floor will have trash chutes that will empty into the trash compactor room. The applicant has utilized trash compactors on other projects and found many benefits: keeps garage inside, keeps the property clean, and the compactor helps manage the smell. The Town Homes and Carriage units will have a garbage "toter" and trash pick-up at their door/garage.

Vice Chair Donlon asked if Board members had any other comments.

Board Member Halldow asked for clarification regarding the size of "Building 1" labeled on the plans. He commented that the building looked larger on the Power Point presentation shown than it did on the plans submitted as part of the application, particularly noting the turn around. Dave Reidman explained that the plans are undergoing some changes. Dave Reidman thought it was important to make the court yard deeper for people visiting the leasing office to eliminate a long way from the drop off into the building.

Doug DeRue, the Director of Planning and Zoning asked the applicant to send the most current, up to date set of plans to the Department of Public Works for review by the necessary departments and agencies.

Board Member Liebschutz asked if the sidewalks are being installed indefinitely. Dave Reidman answered yes. She also asked if it is possible to see elevation renderings from East Avenue with the existing and proposed plantings. Dave Reidman also answered yes. Doug DeRue, the Director of Planning and Zoning, asked them to please include the Wright House in the depiction.

Vice Chair Donlon asked if there were any other questions from the Board.

Seeing none, Vice Chair Donlon made a motion to open the Public Hearing. Board Member Morabito seconded followed by all unanimous voice votes. None were opposed.

Vice Chair Donlon noted 3 resident letters received as public comment for the application for Kilbourn Place Apartments. The first letter was received 10/15/20 from Larry and Maleia Dix of 76 Kilbourn Road, the second received on 10/26/20 from Robert and Patricia Loveland of 15 Kilbourn Road, and the third received on 10/26/20 from Carolyn Radin of 373 Kilbourn Road. He summarized the concerns of the comments made by each resident letter submitted.

Vice Chair Donlon then asked if anyone in attendance of the virtual meeting would like to make a comment. Jessica Yaeger, Planning Board Secretary, then made a note that anyone in attendance of the meeting that would like to comment should select "raise hand" and would be allowed to make a comment to the Board and applicant.

The first "raised hand" was from David Garcia of 225 Overbrook Road. Mr. Garcia addressed the Board and voiced concerns about their decreasing property value due to the approval of the project. He asked that the Planning Board consider mitigations that could possibly preserve part of their property values. He asked about a separate recycling stream accommodated for in addition to the trash compactors. Dave Reidman answer yes there will be. Mr. Garcia added another concern he has is about lighting. With the 58 lights proposed with the apartment complex, each of which are 150 watts with 16,000 lumens, which he feels are not sustainable and emits a lot of light. He suggests using more energy efficient lighting with more downcast light for less of a glow from development for surrounding neighborhoods. He also wants the Planning Board not to allow any additional lighting to be added to the exterior of the building to minimize that as well. Vice Chair made note of that. Mr. Garcia also asked if any berming was along East Ave. He wondered if any more dimensionality could be added through possible berming along East Avenue.

Next, Don Frisbee of 3476 East Avenue "raised a hand" to comment. They are the property adjoining the West lot line of the Back Nine parcel. He noted that the applicant referred to their property as a rental property. Although as property owners they do not reside at the property, he hopes that that doesn't discount their concerns to the Planning Board. From his observation, the new building location and parking area on the Back Nine parcel appears closer to their lot line than previously proposed. He remains concerned about headlights from the cars parking in the complex shining into the residence on his property. He asked if they did in fact move the building closer to the lot line, if there is less parking (as mentioned previously by applicant) and asked if parking could be placed at an angle to help lower the headlights aimed directly at his property. Mr. Frisbee also had questions about snow removal with the parking areas and

plowing/pushing the snow towards his property as he is worried about water run-off and storm water drainage.

Vice Chair Donlon replied that Town Staff and the Town Engineer are in the process reviewing the plans and technical pieces of the application and the applicant and Board will be receive more details with DRC comments addressing these issues.

Mr. Frisbee asked if the building had been moved from the July 7<sup>th</sup> plans that were approved through Town Board. Vice Chair Donlon asked Doug DeRue to comment as he did not have those drawings to refer to.

Doug DeRue, the Director of Planning and Zoning, answered that from what he can tell there were minor shifts made including the building and parking, moving closer to the Frisbee's property. He doesn't know an exact measurement, but did make note to see if it was a necessity to do that. He added he appreciates Mr. Frisbee's comment about the snow removal as it is commonly overlooked and is something that he is also going to be addressing with the applicant.

Vice Chair Donlon asked about the number of parking spaces (Town suggested number vs. actual number on plans), wondering if the Planning board had any room for discussion. Doug DeRue noted that the Planning board has room for discussion, the number just cannot be any less than the 208 required by the Town Board.

Vice Chair Donlon asked if Mr. Frisbee had any other questions. Mr. Frisbee expressed his frustration with the previously mentioned issues. He has expressed these issues continuously throughout this project's process and feels like he is being ignored. Vice Chair Donlon reminded Mr. Frisbee that parking, design and layout is the Planning Board's review and they will make sure to address concerns. Mr. Frisbee acknowledged that note. He added he has concerns about complex renters mistaking his driveway for the entrance to the complex as it's happened when the Back Nine Restaurant was in business. He also had questions about landscaping buffering along his lot line (what fencing proposed and landscaping to be installed). Vice Chair Donlon said that this is a point of discussion through this application process. He encouraged Mr. Frisbee to submit any ideas of what would be acceptable to him.

Mr. Frisbee ended his comments by asking if the Board had an exact answer as to whether or not the number of parking spots increased or decreased. Mr. DeRue answered that more review is coming and they will be able to provide an answer as more review is completed. Mr. Frisbee thanked the Board for their time.

Vice Chair Donlon asked if there were any more public comments or "hands raised" to make a comment? Jessica Yaeger, Planning Board Secretary, answered that she did not see any hands raised for comment.

Seeing none, Vice Chair Donlon explained the hearing will remain open, so if anyone from the public would like to make comment, they are encouraged to do so at the next meeting.

#### **OTHER DISCUSSION:**

The minutes of September 14, 2020 were approved following a motion by Vice Chair Donlon seconded by Board Member Liebschutz. Following a unanimous voice vote, the minutes were approved, none opposed.

Approved Minutes 10-26-20

Vice Chair Donlon motioned to close the meeting at 8:00 p.m., seconded by Board Member Halldow and was approved by a unanimous voice vote, no opposition.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Jessica Yaeger  
Planning Board Secretary

OFFICIAL MINUTES ARE ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE PLANNING  
DEPARTMENT