

**AGENDA
TOWN OF PITTSFORD
PLANNING BOARD
OCTOBER 28, 2024**

This agenda is subject to change.

Please take notice that the Town of Pittsford Planning Board will hold the following meeting on Monday, October 28, 2024, in the Lower-Level Meeting Room of Pittsford Town Hall, 11 S. Main Street, and beginning at 6:30PM local time.

The Board will hold an agenda review session in the Second-Floor Meeting Room at 6:00PM.

CONTINUED HEARING

Passero Associates, Pittsford Oaks Apartments
Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Preliminary Site Plan

OTHER BUSINESS

Approval of Minutes

The next scheduled meeting is for Monday, November 11, 2024.

**TOWN OF PITTSFORD
PLANNING BOARD
SEPTEMBER 9, 2024**

Minutes of the Town of Pittsford Planning Board meeting held on September 9, 2024 at 6:30PM local time. The meeting took place in the Lower-Level Meeting Room of Pittsford Town Hall, 11 S. Main Street.

PRESENT: Kevin Morabito, Hali Buckley, Paul Alguire, Paula Liebschutz, John Halldow, Dave Jefferson

ABSENT: John Limbeck

ALSO PRESENT: Doug DeRue, Director of Planning, Zoning, and Development; April Zurowski, Planning Assistant; Evan Harkin, Student Member; Robert Koegel, Town Attorney; Kim Taylor, Town Board Liaison

ATTENDANCE: There were 8 members of the public present.

Vice Chairman Halldow made a motion to call the meeting to order, seconded by Board Member Morabito. Following a unanimous voice vote, the meeting opened at 6:30PM, none opposed.

CONTINUED HEARING:

Passero Associates, Pittsford Oaks Apartments
Preliminary/Final Subdivision and Preliminary Site Plan

Jerry Goldman, of Woods Oviatt Gilman, LLP; Danny Daniele, of 2851 Clover, LLC; Andrew Burns, of Passero Associates; and Hans Lindenhovius, of Christa Construction, introduced the application.

Mr. Goldman stated that the applicant has no additional information to present to the Board. They have reviewed the draft resolution.

Vice Chairman Halldow stated that the resolution identifies outstanding questions. The Board discussed in the pre-meeting that it does not feel comfortable voting on the draft resolution tonight. He stated that board members would like to hear comments from the Design Review & Historic Preservation Board (DRHPB) before a resolution to the Preliminary Site Plan application. Board Member Jefferson and Board Member Liebschutz agreed. Mr. DeRue stated that the DRHPB canceled both meetings in August, so they were unable to discuss the project. Mr. DeRue confirmed that some DRHPB members submitted emails showing concerns with the current proposal.

Board Member Morabito stated his support of the application and his readiness to vote. Board Member Buckley thanked the applicant for providing additional information regarding traffic concerns. She shared her readiness to vote.

Mr. Anthony Daniele stated that the DRHPB provided comments to the Town Board during their deliberation to rezone the parcels in the Tobey PUD. Board Member Buckley stated that the Planning Board would like specific comments on massing and scale. Feedback from the DRHPB on ways to minimize impacts should be reviewed prior to Preliminary Site Plan

approval. She asked the applicant their opinion on scaling down the building. Mr. Danny Daniele stated that the rooflines were revised in early 2024. The applicant is looking to begin demolition on the site. It will be hard to continue asbestos removal without Preliminary Site Plan approval.

Vice Chairman Halldow proposed to table the application until the next Planning Board meeting.

Board Member Liebschutz asked Mr. Koegel to clarify the weight of a Preliminary Site Plan approval. Mr. Koegel stated that the Board cannot go back on its approval. Board Member Buckley asked if the building height could be reduced after Preliminary Site Plan approval. Mr. Koegel stated that a Preliminary Site Plan approval is the Board approving what was presented.

Mr. Danny Daniele stated that the Town Board voted on the rezoning after it received comments from the DRHPB. He asked Town Board Member Taylor to confirm. Town Board Member Taylor stated that the comments requested from the Town Board are different from what the Planning Board appears to be looking for.

Vice Chairman Halldow stated that this application will be tabled until the next meeting.

Mr. DeRue stated that the DRHPB provided comments as part of the Development Review Committee (DRC) report. The DRHPB has not had an opportunity to meet and discuss the applicant's responses to the DRC report. Mr. Goldman stated his understanding that the DRHPB providing comments to the Planning Board is a typical process.

Mr. Danny Daniele left the meeting.

Mr. DeRue stated that the applicant should continue working out concerns within the draft Preliminary Site Plan resolution, so that the project can continue moving forward. Mr. Koegel agreed. Mr. Anthony Daniele stated that the applicant cannot work out many details before the DRHP comments are received.

Vice Chairman Halldow stated that there is an open public hearing on this matter and invited members of the public to speak. Hearing none, Vice Chairman Halldow stated that it will remain an open public hearing.

NEW HEARING:

Marathon Engineering, Irondequoit Country Club Recreation Building
Preliminary/Final Site Plan and Special Use Permit

John August, on behalf of Irondequoit Country Club, introduced the application. The applicant is requesting to demolish the existing recreation building and rebuild in a slightly different location. The paddle courts will also be relocated, and additional parking spaces will be installed.

Matt Tomlinson, of Marathon Engineering, stated that the applicant received the DRC report and has provided comments back. The draft resolution was received and has been reviewed. The applicant sees no concerns.

Vice Chairman Halldow asked if Nazareth University was contacted about this project. Mr. August confirmed that Nazareth University has reviewed the plans and expressed no concerns.

Vice Chairman Halldow motioned to open the public hearing, seconded by Board Member Liebschutz. Following a unanimous voice vote, the hearing was opened.

Vice Chairman Halldow invited members of the public to speak on this application.

Hearing none, Vice Chairman Halldow motioned to close the public hearing, seconded by Board Member Buckley. Following a unanimous voice vote, the hearing was closed.

OTHER DISCUSSION:

The minutes of August 26, 2024, were approved following a motion by Vice Chairman Halldow, seconded by Board Member Alguire. Following a unanimous voice vote, the minutes were approved, none opposed.

Board Member Alguire motioned to close the meeting at 7:20PM, seconded by Board Member Liebschutz, and was approved by a unanimous voice vote, none opposed.

Respectfully submitted,

April Zurowski
Planning Assistant

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

From: [Dirk Schneider](#)
To: [Bill Zink](#); [Doug DeRue](#); [Robert Koegel](#); [Anna Piazza](#)
Cc: [Paul Whitbeck](#); ["John Mitchell"](#); ["Bonnie Salem"](#); ["Kathleen Cristman"](#); ["David Wigg"](#); ["Jim Vekasy"](#)
Subject: Town of Pittsford - DRHPB Pittsford Oaks Comments to the Planning Board 10/22/24
Date: Tuesday, October 22, 2024 12:47:50 PM

[EXTERNAL]

Dear Planning Department,

After another informal Pittsford Oaks review meeting on 10/10/24, the DRHPB has the following comments to be provided to the Planning Board outlining concerns that have been voiced from the birth of this development under the new developer.

1. After further discussion and reflection at the board meeting, we hope the Planning Board will hold off on preliminary approval until the developer submits at least one more round of elevations.
2. The developer's recent presentation demonstrated that they can react to our specific suggestions (i.e. focus on just the one end that was most problematic) but their redesign is still 3 stories high, and they made no changes to the rest of the building to integrate the changes. We are still awaiting a cohesive solution that might impact the unit count and therefore possibly the parking requirements. We said they were on the right track - but they have taken only a small step towards a possible approach that will reduce the massing as requested.
3. As mentioned above we think they need to re-examine the whole project in terms of massing, height, repetition, materials and develop a cohesive approach. We mentioned that the H design worked for Cloverwood (previous senior housing option) but now with increased height this is creating a substantial mass. While the project does have some vertical elements to break up the overall mass there is an underlying 'pancaking' or 'banding' that at the scale of this building is a overwhelming. Everything lines up horizontally meaning the stone/concrete base of one story, the next single story of a darker gray material and then the upper two stories of lighter gray. In addition all the trim lines, eave lines, roof lines all follow and are monotonous. They could break up the overall large massing of the building by playing with the 'banding' it could help the appearance that there are smaller masses of building.
4. We also mentioned to maybe explore more drastic interventions along the +/- 400' long building such as removing a few units over 1, 2 or three stories to the double loaded hallway (this would bring daylight in the enormous long internal hallway) and maybe 1 or 2 units wide (varying in the approach) would create a relief possible necessary to help make the mass make less imposing.

Regards,

Dipl.-Ing. DIRK SCHNEIDER, AIA
Town of Pittsford DRHPB, Chair

CAUTION: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM AN EXTERNAL SENDER. Don't click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Terraces At Clover



Pittsford Oaks



Terraces At Clover



Pittsford Oaks



Terraces At Clover (Winter)



Pittsford Oaks (Winter)



Pittsford Oaks (Summer)



Top of Ceiling
Heights Above
Lobby Level

Terraces At Clover & Pittsford Oaks (West Elevations facing Credit Union)

Roof Line Feet
Above Sea Level

31'-



2 West Elevation

31'-



Terraces At Clover & Pittsford Oaks (East Elevations facing Clover Street)

31'-



1 East Elevation

31'-



Terraces At Clover & Pittsford Oaks (East & West Courtyard Elevations)

Top of Ceiling
Heights Above
Lobby Level

Roof Line Feet
Above Sea Level

31'-



590'

2 West Elevation of Courtyard

31'-



590'

1 East Elevation of Courtyard

31'-



590'

2 COURTYARD EAST ELEVATION

31'-



590'

2 COURTYARD EAST ELEVATION

Terraces At Clover & Pittsford Oaks (Similar General “H” Shapes)

