

VILLAGE OF PITTSFORD
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
Special Meeting: September 3, 2020 at 6:00 PM

PRESENT:

Chairperson: Justin Vlietstra
Members: Jo Anne Shannon
Justin Leitgeb
David Marshall
Susan Lhota
Mayor: Robert Corby
Trustees: Renee Stetzer
Frank Galusha
Lili Lanphear

Village Clerk: Dorothea Ciccarelli
Recording Secretary: Linda Habeeb

Chairperson Vlietstra made the following announcements:

Motion: Mayor Corby made a motion, seconded by Member Lanphear, to call the Board of Trustees meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

Vote: Corby – yes; Lanphear – yes; Galusha – yes; Stetzer – yes. Motion carried.

Chairperson Vlietstra stated that pursuant to Governor Cuomo’s recent Executive Orders and due to the Coronavirus pandemic, the Village Hall is closed. The Planning Board is meeting via video conference. There is a notice posted on the Village website that contains a link for the public to join in such a meeting should they be interested in observing our discussions or participating.

Motion: Chairperson Vlietstra made a motion, seconded by Member Marshall, to open the Planning Board meeting at 6:03.

Vote: Shannon – yes; Vlietstra – yes; Leitgeb – yes; Lhota – yes; Marshall – yes. Motion carried.

Member Vlietstra stated that the Planning Board has documented their recommendations and changes to the Active Transportation Plan. There are two documents, the first one is general recommendations for amendments to the Plan. The second document is recommendations for amendments to the Active Transportation Plan to improve compliance with the Local Waterfront Revitalization Plan (LWRP) document. The LWRP recommendations include citations from the LWRP document where the Planning Board found key discrepancies between the LWRP and ATP. He explained that through the Planning Board’s thorough deliberations and review of the LWRP document, there are some good ideas that will improve the ATP document. The Planning Board feels the suggested amendments would not only make the plan better, but actually make it better for the residents as well. He further stated that Planning Board members would like some indication from the Trustees as to how to move forward with these recommendations.

The Trustees indicated that they had read the documents, and generally are in agreement with many of the suggestions. Mayor Corby stated that because the Village has to work with partner organizations, we

can't always guarantee achievement of all the goals that are in the Active Transportation Plan. For example, the Village has asked for removal of the striped area on the Main Street Bridge, and every time this is requested, the DOT has denied this request. Member Stetzer commented that it is important to identify trouble spots, but we want to be able to have all options available to us if the change that was initially recommended is not the best option.

Member Vlietstra stated that the plan should state what the Village's objectives are, and if the DOT doesn't want to implement something, that's a separate matter. The Planning Board wants to have the best plan forward that maximizes benefits for Village residents. Mayor Corby stated that there should be an explanation that these are aspirational goals; this is what's needed to make this truly a walkable space, but we do have to deal with our administrative partners, who, in some cases, have jurisdiction which overrides our authority. For example, the recommendation to change the catch basins to the proposed design. Do we know if these are allowed under New York State Highway Law? There are also standards that are mandated by the new Federal Stormwater Management regulations. Is it technically feasible? These questions need to be addressed. Mayor Corby further stated that the amount of time the Planning Board spent reviewing this Plan warrants having a dedicated meeting to go through the suggestions line-by-line and to go over each one in detail.

Member Lhota stated that since the Board needs to work with these other organizations on the Plan, she questioned whether a member of the DOT should be included in the discussions. If there are other parties that are weighing in on this Plan, they should be represented. Mayor Corby explained that the original document was predicated by a grant funded by the Genesee Transportation Council. As part of the agreement with the Town of Pittsford and the Village, consultation with DOT is required.

Member Lanphear raised the question of whether the goal is to revise the document or to create an amendment to the document. Mayor Corby suggested waiting to review all the issues first, and then make a determination as to which strategy to follow.

Member Vlietstra stated that the Planning Board is concerned about what the legal document is, however it's amended, whether it's an addendum or whether it's the actual document itself. The Planning Board understands that there's a cost for updating the document. Ideally, the changes would be included into the document so there would be a readable document, instead of having a 95-page document, and then a 25-page addendum that modifies the entire document. If the latter is decided on by the Trustees it would still be legal and binding and constitute the Plan.

Member Marshall stated that instead of having joint meetings with all members of both boards, he suggested that the Trustees meet to review the recommendations and invite one or two liaisons from the Planning Board. He said the Planning Board has thoroughly discussed these issues. All members agreed that the Trustees should have meetings to review the comments and invite representatives of the Planning Board to the meetings.

The Planning Board and Trustees discussed the necessity of extending the time deadline to act on the LWRP review of the Active Transportation Plan. The deadline is normally 60 days from the referral, but time is needed to continue discussion of potential amendments to the Active Transportation Plan. The recommendation is for each board to adopt a time extension.

Motion: Member Stetzer made a motion, seconded by Mayor Corby, to extend the LWRP review period 60 days from this evening.

Vote: Corby – yes; Lanphear – yes; Galusha – yes; Stetzer – yes. *Motion carried.*

Motion: Member Lhota made a motion, seconded by Member Marshall, to extend the LWRP review period 60 days from this evening.

Vote: Shannon – yes; Vlietstra – yes; Leitgeb – yes; Lhota – yes; Marshall – yes. *Motion carried.*

Motion: Chairperson Vlietstra made a motion, seconded by Member Leitgeb, that the Public Hearing will remain open for the LWRP review of the Active Transportation Plan and reconvene discussion of that at the regular meeting on Monday September 21.st

Vote: Shannon – yes; Vlietstra – yes; Leitgeb – yes; Lhota – yes; Marshall – yes. *Motion carried.*

Motion: Chairperson Vlietstra made a motion, seconded by Member Leitgeb, to adjourn the meeting.

Vote: Shannon – yes; Vlietstra – yes; Leitgeb – yes; Lhota – yes; Marshall – yes. *Motion carried.*

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary