

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING**

Monday, August 29, 2022, at 5:30 PM

PRESENT:

Chairperson: Jeffrey Pollock
Members: Cristina Lanahan
William McBride – Via Zoom
Kendra Evans
Daniel Olson

Village Attorney: Jeff Turner
Building Inspector: N/A
Recording Secretary: Kristen Kreiser

CALL TO ORDER

Motion by Member Evans, and seconded by Chairperson Pollock, to open the HPB meeting for August 29th, 2022.

Vote: Pollock – yes; Lanahan – yes; Evans – yes; Olson – yes; *Motion Carries.*

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE

Board members indicated that they had no conflicts of interest to disclose.

• **75 Monroe Avenue**

Present: Chris DiMarzo, Chris Nadler, Craig Jensen

Chris DiMarzo and Craig Jensen went through updates and answered questions that were requested by the HPB members from the previous HPB meeting on July 28th, 2022.

Member Evans brought up a concern regarding what the view from the Sutherland Highschool field will look like in relation to the new development having four stories and the look of green space. She requested the applicant provide the view as she would like the cityscape view to be preserved.

The applicant advised that there was an extensive study during the time they did their SEQR and the drawings that had been done at that time included 28% of the project having four stories and now only 3% of the project has four stories. The applicant stated they would find those drawings or provide updated ones.

Member McBride wanted to confirm the percentages for the four stories part of the development a little more. The applicant explained the fourth story is about 20% - 25% of building 7 and building 7 is about 20% of the total, if calculated it would be about 4% or 5% of the total project having a fourth floor. The overall cubic footage did go up 2%.

Member Olson wanted to discuss access to the canal, and the proposals for public access, as well as sidewalk width, being wide enough for the public, and the length and size of the dock for more boat access.

The applicant explained there will be public docks, a sidewalk network, 8 park benches, public restrooms, gazebos, kayak/canoe launch, and the restaurant being public. The applicant

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING**

Monday, August 29, 2022, at 5:30 PM

mentioned the sidewalks can be looked at that are located in key areas. The floating dock is 500ft and the length was on the application for the permit to the Canal Corporation. The dock is adjustable and can always be added to.

Member McBride brought up public parking and inquired if the number of public parking spots was reasonable.

The applicant discussed the underground parking, and the number of parking spots allotted per unit. Street parking will be mostly used for guests and public use. The question came up of the exact number of public parking spots and the applicant is going to review the site plan for that information.

Member Olson brought up the pool that is located at the clubhouse with questions regarding the size of the pool compared to the size of the development, if the pool is needed and whether the pool would have public access.

The applicant explained the development is going to be at a high market rate and that having a pool amenity is something people want at that level. He explained the pool at the clubhouse ties in with the fitness center and recreation room that would be for residents only. The size of the pool is adequate and could not be made to be much bigger in the area that it is in.

Member McBride asked about the tower at the restaurant, what it will be used for, and the possibility of having it reduced from three stories to two stories.

The applicant explained it is for an elevator to overrun the second floor and gives contrast and variety to the building. He did state it could be changed. The top is 15ft across and relatively small in terms of frontage.

Member McBride stated he liked the work that was done making this waterfront public. He does not believe there is another commercial structure in the village that has this kind of sponsored public access.

Parking was briefly discussed again in regards to spots being delineated so there is designated public parking. There were some suggestions like having a timeline of how long a vehicle could be parked in a certain spot or possibly having designated signs. The applicant did state there will be parking regulations.

The applicant brought in some of the exterior materials that were requested at the previous HPB meeting. He explained each of the materials and passed them around for the board to touch, see and ask questions.

The restaurant will seat 125 people and that includes the bar.

Member Olson commented again about the sidewalks being widened all the way up and down the canal.

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING**

Monday, August 29, 2022, at 5:30 PM

PUBLIC COMMENT –

All written correspondence has been entered into the record

Lisa Cove – 44 South Main Street

Present at the meeting. Thank you for the cleanup, questions about docks, walkways, garbage receptacles, and who will maintain them. Materials issues – if new builds can use certain materials the Village residents should be able to as well. Planning Board, LWRP findings go beyond scope of HPB certificate of appropriateness. It is recommended that HPB let the Planning Board inconsistency determination stand. HPB should not have the ability to alter the footprint of a project – landscaping, lot coverage, public amenities, etc.

Fran Kramer – 17 Golf Avenue

Present at the meeting. Resident since 1975, living in a dream village. The Zoning Board is the lead agency and they said no, why override? The development needs to fit with what the village already has in every aspect. Why the rush? How will this look generations from now? Board needs to take into account everyone that lives in the village, we pay taxes and your salaries, and we expect you to represent us.

M.V

Present at the meeting. Concerned with cityscape view from Sutherland. The view and sunsets are beautiful, cannot imagine the view with a four-story building added. The percentage of the building is an issue and doesn't seem like it fits with the village. There is a concern about the public benefit and parking, who controls the docks? The traffic is already problematic on that section of Monroe and there are concerns about pedestrian safety. Would like to see the developer work with Planning to create a project consistent with LWRP.

Jan Pazral – 19 Van Cortland Drive

Present at the meeting. Came in 1984 as a tourist, and bought a house six years later. The proposal is totally out of character with no historical resemblance. How does the brownfield cleanup justify a four-story building with seven buildings on top of each other? The site does not belong in Pittsford, it will be an eyesore. The 93,000 sq ft green space is beautiful, but it is dispersed through the project. In a few generations, the kids will ask, who approved this.

Mike Reynolds – 35 Church Street

Present at the meeting. The HPB should not overrule the Planning Board for specific criteria including no reasonable alternatives, overriding public benefit, etc. The alternatives need to be considered. Do not approve this project.

Art Pires – 70 State Street

Present at the meeting. Letter was read to the public that was previously emailed to the HPB. A formal opposition to the HPB approving the PCP's written appeal reversing the Planning Boards LWRP inconsistency determination. The findings of the Planning Board provide clear justification for the inconsistency determination. It is incumbent upon the HPB to deny the appeal on all facts presented. (Full letter entered into the record)

Dave McGeough – 28 Washington Avenue

Present at the meeting. Fifteen years into the project and others want to know what's the rush? Where was everyone during the PZBA meetings? A few online posts and everyone has an

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING**

Monday, August 29, 2022, at 5:30 PM

opinion. Things being overturned, developers taking advantage, loopholes, etc. a lot of this came from a questionable post by the 75 Monroe - PZBA acting Chair. People are getting mixed up on public benefit when it used to be an oil dump, and tons of contaminated soil was removed. A benefit is people moving in and spending money in the village at local businesses.

Marty Martina – 30 Locust Street

Present at the meeting. Don't have a lot to say, but all the discussion about responsibilities for your own board is interesting pertaining to materials, sidewalks, characteristics, etc. HPB should stay in its own lane. If the vote goes through this will set a precedence that if you are not happy with one board's decision you can go to another. Not satisfied with the decision of the HPB.

Colleen Anderson – 5 Elmbrook Drive

Present at the meeting. Strongly urge HPB not to reverse the PZBA's decision it is after all the planning board's purview to make such judgment calls. There do not seem to be any considerable benefits to the project for current residents. Not the first thing we want to see or want other people to see when crossing the bridge on Monroe into the Village. Traffic is already a problem and who wants to live that close to the tracks? Whatever is built at 75 Monroe must complement the historic nature of the Village.

Elizabeth Hamlin – 17 Sutherland Street

Present at the meeting. Grew up in Pittsford and moved back last year to raise children in the historic Pittsford Village. Concerned about the multi-story development not having any historic charm, and will infringe on the identity of the village. The development does not hold up to village standards, will quickly become outdated and will certainly be an eyesore. There is no overriding public benefit. There are so many other wonderful things this land could be used for.

Ben Hamlin – 17 Sutherland Street

Present at the meeting. Grew up in Pittsford and moved back last year to raise children in the historic Pittsford Village. Biggest concern is that the development is not going to honor the unique charm of Pittsford Village and it is not going to override public benefit. The design is not historical and does not have the proper context. There is a lack of parking and having such a large development will increase traffic and there are currently traffic issues and concerns.

Justin Vlietstra – 19 Boughton Avenue

Spoke via zoom link. HPB looked at this project in 2012 and thought it was too big. A consultant was hired and agreed there was nothing that big not only in the village but almost in all of Monroe County just about. The development is not approvable and the problems never get fixed and it ties the hands of a board from fixing it later. Get a design all 3 boards are happy with, nothing good comes out of pinning one board against another. Get a solid set of plans that addresses all the problems and the approvals can fly right through.

Susan Julien – 56 Monroe Avenue

Spoke via zoom link. Village resident for the past 10 years, living across the street from the proposed development. There are many concerns that have already been submitted to the board in writing. Objection to the building materials because they are inconsistent with the materials that all village residents have to adhere to. We need to be fair to all the villagers, if the developer is being given the opportunity to use whatever he wants the villagers should be able to as well. But that is not what is wanted, we want to keep the historic nature of the village.

**VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING**

Monday, August 29, 2022, at 5:30 PM

Mary Ellen – 24 Wood Stone Rise

Via Q&A. Two Questions: (1) Does the Canal Corp need final approval or input as, it is my understanding, that the organization has NYS wide plans for Canal Usage? (2) What group will be maintaining the restrooms, green space, and docks? Thank you.

Teresa Barno-Rossi – 9 Sutherland Street

Present at the meeting. One thing that has not been addressed is the noise that would be coming from the bar/restaurant, there was something that stated bands and music would end at 10 PM. This is a major inconvenience for anyone that goes to bed early or has children.

The board and the applicant had some brief discussions. Member Evans requested what a view from Sutherland High Schools' athletic field would look like with the development built. She also gave her input and concerns on where she stands as far as building materials as well as mass and scale (four stories). Member Olson agreed with Member Evans's concerns.

The board agreed they wanted more time to take in the information from the meeting and the input from the residents before making any decisions, especially on reasonable alternatives.

Motion by Chairperson Pollock, and seconded by Member Olson to adjourn the HPB Special Meeting to Thursday, September 1st, 2022.

Vote: Pollock – yes; Lanahan – yes; Evans – yes; Olson – yes; McBride – yes; *Motion Carries.*

MEETING MINUTES –

Motion by Member Evans, and seconded by Chairperson Pollock to approve the meeting minutes for August 22nd, 2022 as written.

Vote: Pollock – yes; Lanahan – yes; Evans – yes; Olson – yes; McBride – Abstain; *Motion Carries.*

Motion by Member Evans, and seconded by Chairperson Pollock to adjourn the HPB Special Meeting.

Vote: Pollock – yes; Lanahan – yes; Evans – yes; Olson – yes; McBride – yes; *Motion Carries.*

Kristen Kreiser, Recording Secretary

Further detailed information about this specific meeting is available on the website.