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CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Good evening. I'd like to call to order the March session of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Rick, was the meeting properly advertised?

MR. DiSTEFANO: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it was advertised in the Brighton-Pittsford Post of March 1, 2018.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. Could you please call the roll.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Please let the record show that Mr. Clapp is not present.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. So let's start with the minutes, Judy.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Page 5, Line 11, the word SEQRA is S-E-Q-R-A.

Page 7, Line 8, the first word is r-o-a-d.

Page 10, Line 13, and throughout the rest of the application is B-e-a.

Page 26, Line 8, the first word is neighbors.

Page 54, the very last Line 25, it should be A-R-B.

Page 57, Line 11, insert the word one after inside.

Page 71, Line 11, the fourth word is t-o.
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Page 96, Line 18, the last word is building.
Page 97, Line 3, insert the word a-r-e after building; Line 6 of the same page the second word is approvals. That's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Motion, please?

MS. CORRADO: Motion.

(Second by Ms. Tompkins Wright.)

(Ms. Schwartz, yes; Ms. Tomkins Wright, yes Ms. Dale, yes; Mr. Mietz, yes; Ms. Watson, yes; Ms. Corrado, yes.)

(Upon roll call, motion to approve with corrections carries.)

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay, Rick, whenever you're ready, the first application.

MR. DI STEFANO: Yes, I suggest we take 3A-01 and 3A-02 together.

APPLICATION 3A-01-18

3A-01-18 Application of 1950 Brighton Henrietta Town Road, LP, owner of property located at 1950 Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road, for an Area Variance from Section 205-8 to allow impervious lot coverage, after site improvements, to be 74.5% of the lot area in lieu of the maximum 65% allowed by code. All as described on application
and plans on file.

APPLICATION 3A-02-18

3A-02-18 Application of 1950 Brighton Henrietta Town Road, LP, owner of property located at 330 Metro Park, for an Area Variance from Section 205-8 to allow impervious lot coverage, after site improvements, to increase from 73.5% of lot area to 79% in lieu of the maximum 65% impervious lot coverage allowed by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

PAUL COLUCCI: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, my name is Paul Colucci of the DiMarco Group. Joining me tonight is Matt Tomlinson from Marathon Engineering, here tonight on behalf of the applicant for the two requested area variances that Rick just read.

Just a quick background, I know the agenda is lengthy tonight so I won't be overly verbose with my presentation. Our corporate offices, the DiMarco Family and Company corporate offices, are located at 1950 Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road. We've been there for a number of years. That building houses several companies, including DiMarco Constructors, Baldwin Real Estate Management, J. DiMarco Builders, DiMarco Realty Services, and ADMAR Supply. ADMAR Supply, for those of you that are not
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familiar is an equipment sales and leasing and maintenance company; heavy construction equipment, aerial lifts, light towers. ADMAR has enjoyed a lot of success in recent years. We're up to 11 branches in three different states now.

About three years ago we had the opportunity to acquire 330 Metro Park, which is located just to the east of our outdoor storage yard where all of the equipment is stored. This was a unique opportunity for us to acquire a piece of property that was directly adjacent to our corporate offices as ADMAR's branch was looking to relocate out of the corporate office.

All of the businesses are growing, we're adding people, we're out of space. And rather than move ADMAR's branch facility out of the town or look for another location, we purchased 330 Metro Park. We are in the process of raising the roof on that building, literally. We're raising the roof nine feet to make it all high base space so that it is a more marketable building. We are before the Planning Board right now. We had an introductory meeting with the Planning Board March 7th, where we presented the site plan modifications to allow the branch to be relocated to 330 Metro Park and have connectivity from 330 to the outdoor storage yard.
As we are doing so and meeting with town staff over the course of several meetings, we looked at bring 1950 Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road into compliance. ADMAR has grown considerably and when you own construction equipment and they need more room, they tend to make room for themselves and we're looking to bring that outdoor storage yard back into compliance and have an area variance request to allow greater than the allowable impervious lot coverage on the lot which is 1950 Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road, and move the branch over to 330.

I am going to let Matt go through some of those specifics as he has an exhibit for you, and then we are happy to answer any questions you might have.

MR. DiSTEFANO: And, Paul, just for the record, that Planning Board meeting was February 21st, you said March 7th, which is tonight.

PAUL COLUCCI: Thank you.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Just let the record reflect that.

MATT TOMLINSON: As Paul mentioned, Matt Tomlinson from Marathon. Paul was someplace warm on vacation that day, so that's probably why he forgot about it. I was here though.
As Paul mentioned, we are looking for two area variances and I just want to step -- the numbers are in your packets obviously, but I just want to talk through a little bit what the mitigations are that we are proposing for those variances. Currently on the property there is very minimal storm water management, it actually is up in the corner here, there is a storm system here, and there's a swale that comes through. So we are proposing to construct a storm water management facility that will treat not only the runoff from the new impervious areas but also the areas of the storage area that have grown since the previously permitted portion. So it will be mitigating, if you will, all of the storm water for those areas that are impervious now that may or may not have been in previous approvals.

In addition, there's portions of solid fence which come back along the property lines to about the midway point, and then to the rear of that there is not solid fence, which is one of the requirements for outdoor storage areas in the Town of Brighton. So we will be constructing a solid six-foot-high fence around the remainder of that.

In addition, through discussions with the Town, the storage yard is required to be 50 feet inside of the property line. One of the ways we're accomplishing
conformance with that is we have worked with the ADMAR folks to delineate the 50-foot buffer, 50-foot setback requirement, for that storage yard by constructing paved to binder roadway that will delineate where their equipment limits are, and also allow for better flow and a reduction in traffic that would otherwise be driven between Brighton Henrietta Town Line and Metro to circulate if that connection point wasn't there.

So recognizing that's, as Paul mentioned, the construction equipment owned by this company or this use has created a nonconforming issue. We're doing our best to bring that closer to compliance today.

And then for 330 Metro, I mentioned the traffic. That increase is as minimal as we could get it to allow for access and functionality of that storage yard with that parcel. So with that, I would be happy to answer --

MR. Di Stefano: Would you just explain a little bit the interconnection between them and how that's going to work?

Paul Colucci: Yes, and Paul can correct me if I'm wrong, but ADMAR Corporate, so the corporate portion has equipment brought back to it from the branches if their on-site maintenance folks can't fix an issue after it comes
back from rentals or if there's specialized equipment coming to and fro, it comes here first and then goes out to the branches if necessary. And so the functionality of some of the service overlaps with the branch because this is -- rents equipment, operates as a branch for contractors. So you have people like myself who might have a large yard project, I need to rent a bobcat or something like that, coming in with pickup trucks, trailers, as well as heavy equipment.

So as far as functionality and flow connecting the rear of 330 to that storage yard is going to allow for the branch operation specific to the Rochester branch, and contractors, that kind of thing. Kind of isolating from equipment being loaded onto trailers, larger equipment, flatbeds, lowboys, that kind of thing.

In the rear service of equipment that comes in can also come in through the yard, come into the wash and service bays and then go back out to the yard to be staged for the next renter. So it really separates and delineates the operations of those and again allows for that to be internal to the screened storage yard versus more traffic at the external portions of the properties.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Just quickly then, the traffic that now comes off of Brighton Henrietta Town Line
Road and then comes up onto the west side of the building to enter, so are we saying that that would be minimized by using the Metro Park entrance? So in other words, if I was the guy with the pickup truck and I'm going to go down Metro Park and enter that way I wouldn't have anything to do with the front of Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road.

MATT TOMLINSON: Yeah, the day-to-day leasing of equipment, not necessarily the larger equipment that gets delivered to a job site or picked up, but the day-to-day pickup trucks, surveyors bringing equipment to be serviced, all that would come through the storefront, the showroom and the area on 330.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: And is there any suggestion that once that change is made that there would be any increase in the amount of larger pieces of equipment coming in or the volume of that due to the expansion of 11 locations of ADMAR?

PAUL COLUCCI: We don't envision that there's going to be an increase in volume of traffic. As Matt explained, the ADMAR Corporate will remain at 1950 Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road, it will continue to service corporate-related equipment as Matt accurately stated. The branch operation is relocating to 330.
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Yes, the company is growing but we also envision that this same volume of business that ADMAR branch is doing is just going to move over to a new location. So now with two driveways the theory is that the traffic out of the westerly entrance at 1950 should go down, because there's not branch traffic coming there. That's going to come off Metro Park and out.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: And that makes sense. I guess really my question though is, with that as an accepted, we'll accept that then is there going to be more business because of the expansion of ADMAR and elsewhere that the Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road that these pieces of commercial equipment that are being brought in to the then dispensed to somewhere else would increase because you'd have more capacity now on the Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road side.

PAUL COLUCCI: It's a valid question. I don't believe that it would. Buffalo similarly has a corporate maintenance facility that services Ohio -- or I'm sorry, the Cleveland, Youngstown, Erie and then this is another node that is supporting Canandaigua, Syracuse, Watertown, Vestal. And so we really don't envision that we're going to explode with volume because we are growing branches. We can only
functionally service equipment within such proximity to the branches.

MR. DiSTEFANO: And is it true to say that your storage yard is going to be limited now by the ring road and by this variance that you're requesting so that 1950 is not really going to be able to grow in size.

PAUL COLUCCI: No, it will not. And we are actually consolidating the storage yard looking at forcing them to become more judicious with how they organize themselves, more orderly as they maintain the storage yard. If not given boundaries they tend to grow and take liberty, so we're putting the reins on them, so to speak.

MATT TOMLINSON: One other item that I neglected to mention, currently there's some outdoor storage trailers out there and DiMarco corporate -- or the construction side of DiMarco also has some storage outside. And a portion of this building that's not occupied by ADMAR, that will be used for the warehousing of some of that material -- for building materials that currently have to be stored inside trailers.

PAUL COLUCCI: That's a great point. This building is actually 40,000-square feet, ADMAR's taking the darker portion of it. The rest of this building and this
connection point is for corporate warehousing. So we can actually store DiMarco constructors-related equipment inside of the building rather than in outdoor storage areas and become more orderly with how we maintain that outdoor storage area.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: So that square footage on the Metro Park building, how would you characterize the percentage of how it's going to be used then? What percentage would be the rental operations or consumers, would you say?

PAUL COLUCCI: It's 18 and 22. It's close to 50/50 and we broke that down in the parking submittal to the Planning Board.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. Other questions?

MR. DiSTEFANO: Yeah, I have two questions. One, just I think it might help the Board a little bit and they probably have seen it in the plan, but if you just could give a quick explanation of where you're picking up impervious surface at 330?

And then second, with 1950, you got basically two lots that are part of 1950. Why can't that lot line be moved at 1950, so that -- I mean, you're moving it now anyways as part of the project, why can't it be moved so that
you meet code in regards to the green space?

    MATT TOMLINSON: Sure. So I'll speak to 330 Metro first. The rear property line is here and so to provide the connections to the storage yard we're constructing the area that allows the ring road as well as three overhead doors for access to that maintenance portion, and then for the warehousing portion. So that piece is relatively straight forward.

    This area is not additional impervious, it's existing now but there's recess loading docks that we'll be filling in and just bringing to grade for smaller equipment to get in and out.

    And then, I don't know if anyone was able to visit the site, but currently there's a split Y connection to the two parking areas that doesn't function real well. So we're just formalizing that and making it easier for two-way traffic to go through that intersection.

    So 330 is relatively minimized. As Rick mentioned currently this is Zero West Metro on this side and this is 1950 Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road. As part of this proposal and to get the storage yard ring road, everything else on the same lot, we have before the Planning Board lot line adjustment moving that line here to the
extension of the northern most property of 330 Metro. As Rick mentioned, Zero West Metro goes out to West Metro.

In order to bring this into compliance with the current configuration we have to add approximately an acre and a half of that West Metro parcel to 1950 Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road. In order to accomplish that, that would shrink that lot from roughly six acres down to four and a half, 4.4 acres, somewhere in that neighborhood. And DiMarco group currently owns that parcel as well and are always looking for a new tenant, someone to construct for. And we've schematically laid that out and kind of shared that with town staff relative to the amount of variances that would be require for that parcel, if it shrunk by that much to make it financially viable to develop in the future.

And it's DiMarco group's contention that additional variances for a parcel and limiting what could be added to the tax base is a fair tradeoff for a single user or single variance for something that we will be mitigating by screening storm water and potential reduction in traffic.

So that's kind of what we're trying to balance out here and to Rick's point, we have looked at that with town staff.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Did you consider any
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type of paving that would be more pervious to kind of reduce the impact rather than just asphalt?

MATT TOMLINSON: Sure. So the storage yard itself is all crushed stone. So as a pervious pavement that's about as pervious as you can get. Unfortunately the soil's out here are very heavy clay, you don't get a lot of infiltration or anything like that that would be a benefit.

And by its nature pervious pavement is typically not recommended for any type of heavy construction equipment, which is primarily what we have out here. So we did look at that but other than crushed stone there's not much we can do there.


Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak regarding these applications? There being none, then the Public Hearing is closed.

APPLICATION 3A-03-18

3A-03-18 Application of Art Parts Signs, Inc., contractor, and 2815 Monroe Retail Office, LLC, owner of property located at 2815 Monroe Avenue, for a Sign Variance from Section 207-26D to allow a logo to be 28.75% of the sign area in lieu of the maximum 25% allowed by code. All as
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described on application and plans on file.

PATTY RANSCO: My name is Patty Ransco and I
work at Art Parts Signs. And I have been contracted to take
an existing sign that Whelpley and Paul had that was on
Monroe Avenue close to the 12 Corners and now use that same
sign and put it up at the building that is still on Monroe
Avenue, but across from where the old Clover Lanes was.

I guess I exceed the amount of square feet by
three percent and we would really like to be able to use the
old sign, A, for its nostalgia, but also to save the owners
the cost of manufacturing an entire new sign. I know that
the sign has to be refurbished. It has exposed neon for the
internal lighting as it did when it was on other building on
Monroe Avenue.

So I guess I'm just asking for the allowance
of the additional square footage so that we can avoid having
to manufacture a new sign for the client.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Did you say you would refurbish
the other one?

PATTY RANSCO: Yes. In general, it's not in
great shape, it has some -- we have to sand it and paint it.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Is the sign a separate piece
from the glasses? Is it two pieces?
PATTY RANSCO: Yes. The Whelpley and Paul are channel letters that are on a raceway and the pair of eyeglasses are a separate piece.

MS. SCHWARTZ: I know nostalgia, so, I mean, I've been here forever, but to be more compliant and truly when I drove by it's very nice and neat. The building's not big and each of the signs are roughly the same size. Did you consider just putting up Whelply and Paul and using, I don't know if you could use the glasses somewhere else, but to be more compliant with code?

PATTY RANSCO: Well, that is our plan B, if you deny us the variance then they will and I will propose to them that possibly it could be used inside the building somewhere. But the amount of square footage that we're proposing here is not over what is allowed. We are allowed this square footage, it's just the pair of eye glasses themselves are three percent larger than what they should be.

I know that the logo can only be 25 percent of the actual sign package and this is at 28 percent. So we are just asking your good graces to allow the extra three percent.

MS. WATSON: And the sign is historic, and the eyeglasses and the logo portion they are still being
consistently used as part of brand imaging?

PATTY RANSCO: Yes.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Has this been before the Architectural Review Board yet?

PATTY RANSCO: I believe there was a meeting.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Yes.

PATTY RANSCO: It went before the Architectural Review Board February 27th, so this is the March 7th meeting for the Board of appeals and then it will go to the Planning Board on March 21st.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: What happened?

PATTY RANSCO: It was approved.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Do you have that paperwork with you? I believe it was approved with the condition that they get their variance.

PATTY RANSCO: Yes.

MR. DiSTEFANO: The Architectural Review Board did not have an issue with the sign as presented.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. Could you help us with -- you made some comments on the economics of this, so in other words, to say that the sign with the logo was remade and fit the 25 percent, what kind of money would the tenant be spending to create a new set of eyeglasses?
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PATTY RANSKO: It would double the cost of sign to him at this point.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Restoring the existing one versus --

PATTY RANSKO: Uh, huh. The existing one is actually really well made. It's just that it's steel and over time the inside of it, because it's an exposed face sign, needs to be sanded. Rust, you know, there's some rust in there, the paint is a little flaky and we will repaint it.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: How old is the sign?

PATTY RANSKO: 32 or 37 years old, I believe is what I was told.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay.

PATTY RANSKO: And I remember as a six-year-old kid walking to Twelve Corners to get my eyeglasses fixed with the rest of my brothers and sisters. My dad always claimed we had a mortgage there. There were seven kids.

MS. CORRADO: Once refreshed what do you project the light to the sign to be?

PATTY RANSKO: It will still be exposed neon. So the eyeglasses will light up red as they did at the other location. And the words Whelply and Paul will light up
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white.

MS. CORRADO: And how long do you think the refurbished sign will last? What's the extended lifetime?

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Do they get another 37 years?

PATTY RANSCO: We are hoping so.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Any other questions? Okay thank you.

Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak regarding this application? Please come forward.

MARY SIMPSON: Good evening. We're here tonight to address the signage of our store, Whelply and Paul Opticians.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: If you can do one thing for us before you start is just give us your name.

MARY SIMPSON: My name Mary Simpson, and this is --

LINDA SESSA: Linda Sessa, manager of Whelply and Paul.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: So you're both employees of Whelply and Paul?

MARY SIMPSON: She's the manager of the store.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay, go ahead.
MARY SIMPSON: And we are hoping to get a variance to put up the sign that had been at our previous location in Brighton at 1790 Monroe Avenue. Which is the big red glasses that served as a way to advise first-time customers how to find us. And once the customers were established it was a beacon to guide them back to us.

The historic, I thought it was 50-year-old sign, has led people to come in because their parents brought them to us when they were kids, and they recognized the quality that Whelply and Paul represents. We were so lucky to relocate within the Town of Brighton. At this new location however, people comment on how beautiful the store is but that it would have been easier to find if they -- if our big red glasses were up and restored to its shining example of Brighton history.

We would appreciate being able to put that same historic sign back up to serve not only as a beacon for our customers, but to share the same comradery with our new neighbors along with our old neighbors. Thank you.

LINDA SESSA: And you guys have pictures already?

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: We do.

LINDA SESSA: Okay.
MR. DiSTEFANO: Can I just get your name again?

LINDA SESSA: Linda Sessa, S-e-s-s-a. I just wanted to say that Whelply and Paul has been open for 90 years, the sign has been up for just about 50 years. So we just want to bring a part of history back to the new location because it is important to our customers.

So if people didn't know what it looked like, I did bring a picture, a close-up of what the big glasses used to look like. It's a piece of art more than just assign. So we just want to bring that back to Brighton.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else that would like to speak regarding this application? Then there being none, the public hearing is closed.

APPLICATION 3A-04-18

3A-04-18 Application of The Baptist Temple, owner of property located at 1101 Clover Street, for a Temporary and Revocable Use Permit pursuant to Section 219-4 to allow for a two-day (April 28th & 29, 2018) outdoor educational event in an RLA Single Family District. All as described on application and plans on file.
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CANDY TAPER: Good evening, my name is Candy Taper and I'm a representative of Baptist Temple. The 140th New York Volunteer Infantry gets together every spring for training. They are reenactors that go all around New York and Pennsylvania talking about living history during the Civil War period. We would like to host, we the Baptist Temple would like to host their training this spring in late April and open it up to the public so that they have an audience to actually work with as they go over their drills and training activities. There is a civilian camp, a northern camp, and a southern camp. We are not in any way, shape, or form asking for a battle reenactment. We're not going down that road.

But they do need to practice, they do need to work on their costumes and their dialogue and interact with the public, and we would like to provide that for them. It does require three variances in order for them to provide a reenactment. The first is three fire -- campfires in their encampments. They would dig a hole for this and line it with stones, and we do have a security and fire watch volunteers from the Brighton Fire Department that have already committed to cover that for the three days.

The second is the potential noise ordinance
violation. They would like to be able to discharge their black powder guns between the hours of 11:00 and 3:00 p.m. on Saturday. There are no projectiles with this at all, it will strictly be a noise factor.

And the third thing is to be able to set up small tents and make the encampments outside for their infantry to sleep in. That's basically it unless you have some questions.

MS. DALE: So when you say that they want to have the ability to discharge the rifles and you're talking about, you know, between 11:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., so a four-hour window. What are we talking about? I mean, are we talking about a war for four hours?

CANDY TAPER: No, absolutely not.

MS. DALE: How many --

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Approximately.

CANDY TAPER: I would say they have eight members in their battalion and they are going to practice loading, getting down on a knee, marching to another location. So you're probably getting six shots of eight guns at a time, six times an hour for that three-hour period.

MS. DALE: And how far away do you think the noise carries? I'm just not familiar with --
CANDY TAPER: It's not as loud as fireworks, but it's louder than firecrackers.

MS. DALE: How many people are you thinking are going to be doing this, and sleeping in tents.

CANDY TAPER: 40.

MS. DALE: Is the 40 people max.

CANDY TAPER: Uh-huh, there's 40 reenactors that would be sleeping there, yes.

MS. DALE: And in addition it will be open to the public?

CANDY TAPER: Yes.

MS. DALE: So 40 reenactors and?

MR. DOLLINGER: 40 overnight.

CANDY TAPER: Yes.

MS. DALE: So when they're camping overnight, they're going to have fires going all night?

CANDY TAPER: Yes. There will be three fire pits, one in each encampment. And they're located -- there was a map in your packet, they're on different sides of the building, they're on the property. They're small, they're like maybe three foot --

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Like a fire pit.

MS. DALE: So the building would be unlocked?
CANDY TAPER: Yes.

MS. WATSON: Will the firefighters be sleeping over with them?

CANDY TAPER: They better not be sleeping, but they will be there 24/7.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Just maybe before we ask some other questions, I think maybe this is the question we all might have, is that what is the linkage of this event to your facility? In other words, why here and what's your linkage with this effort, as far as your facility is concerned?

CANDY TAPER: The Baptist Temple opened up the -- we named a portion of our mission to be the Clover Center for Arts and Spirituality. We have the performing arts portion of the reenactment. Education is a huge portion of it and this particular event will end Sunday morning after a community pancake breakfast and a period worship service where we are actually bringing all of the troops together and having hymns and a sermon from that time period. So we're -- it's an educational endeavor.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: What would your sense be of the amount of public that is going to be part of the events over the stretches of the day, in other words on each
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day. Is there going to be 100 people, 200 people, what are we talking about? Just so we can get a sense for what you anticipate the size of this to be?

CANDY TAPER: We hope to draw in about 300, but I doubt that there would ever be more than 75 there at any one time. There's different activities going on throughout the day. There's a cooking demo, a clothing demo, a millinery, the marching outside, and we have a schedule of times so people will come and go.

MS. DALE: How many parking spots do you have approximately?

CANDY TAPER: I think it's two hundred.

MS. DALE: Will there be other sort of normal events that people coming to worship or other activities happening at the building this day or is this the only thing going on?

CANDY TAPER: That's the only thing going on that weekend. We have included the worship service into the program.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Sunday.

CANDY TAPER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Let's go back. Do you have anything?
MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Just to be clear, only the 40 people who are part of the battalion, whatever this is, they're spread out between the three encampments --

CANDY TAPER: Correct.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: -- and the outside public is not invited to be overnight?

CANDY TAPER: Only to watch, no.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Have you spoken to any of the neighbors about -- that's hard because you have so many neighbors within earshot. I'm just wondering if this has been made public to neighbors so they have an opportunity to know that it's going to be really loud.

CANDY TAPER: We have advertised it around the area and we have spoken to the neighbors. We have had three concerts recently which brought in a lot of neighbors and we have polled them and mentioned it to them. The renaissance on the corner and the two apartment high rises. We have had no issues brought up so far.

MS. SCHWARTZ: And not anything that the people down on Highland Avenue in those houses?

CANDY TAPER: We haven't gone down there yet.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Oh, okay. Have they ever said anything about your concerts in the summer?
CANDY TAPER: No.

MS. DALE: But music is a little different.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Yeah. And on that note, have you had any discussions with the police department? Have you brought that up to anybody in the police department to say there will be gunshots? You know, although they are blanks, people might not realize that they're --

CANDY TAPER: That's true.

MR. DiSTEFANO: -- like gunshots that are going off, especially if they don't see it but they hear it.

CANDY TAPER: Agree. We haven't had that conversation because, quite frankly, I wasn't sure we'd get past tonight.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: That's fair.

MS. CORRADO: Several questions, so for the paying guest, are they buying a ticket at the door or do they need to get it in advance?

CANDY TAPER: This is a free event. The only thing we're charging for is the pancake breakfast.

MS. CORRADO: Okay, so it's come one come all.

Do you have parking management in place --

CANDY TAPER: Yes.

MS. CORRADO: -- if you draw a tremendous
crowd all at once?

CANDY TAPER: Yes. We have the ability --
well, we have traffic directors and we also have the ability
of bussing people from First Baptist and from the Harley
School.

MS. CORRADO: And for the general public
attending, what time do they leave the site, or do they hang
out all night long?

CANDY TAPER: No, no. Let's see, there's no
one on Friday, so Saturday it closes to the public at
4:00 p.m. and Sunday it closes at 1:00.

MS. CORRADO: And sanitation and trash, do you
have plans for keeping the site tidy.

CANDY TAPER: Yes.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: It's similar to the
concert series, you have something in place?

CANDY TAPER: Yes.

MS. CORRADO: And does that include
porta-potties on site or are you directing folks into the --

CANDY TAPER: They can go inside. They're
sufficient inside and there's plenty of water outside. This
many people on the campus is not difficult to accommodate.
We just don't normally have them sleeping out there.
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MS. CORRADO: Right. April weather can be a little dodgy, is there a rain date?

CANDY TAPER: No. They will be inside if it's too bad. But they reminded us that during this period they didn't get to dictate what the weather was.

MS. CORRADO: So rain or shine. As far as the set up and the breakdown, do they need time on Friday beforehand, Monday afterwards or all of the --

CANDY TAPER: They will are arrive between noon on Friday and the campus is to be cleared by 2:00 p.m. on Sunday. We have a concert Sunday night.

MS. CORRADO: Okay. So the time frame that you really need the permit for would be Friday noon through Sunday.

CANDY TAPER: Correct.

MS. CORRADO: So, which is not reflected in the application, but we want to be clear about that. One other question, I think it's pretty self-evident, have you hosted this organization in the past or this is your first experience with them?

CANDY TAPER: This is our first hosting experience. We took our youth group to their training camp a few years ago and were part of that. But this is the first
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time we've had them on site.

MS. DALE: When you went to it, what was
hosting it? Was it another church or was it --

CANDY TAPER: It was like the Sunshine Club
here, a Rotary? It was a Rotary camp that hosted them. They
were in Pennsylvania.

MS. CORRADO: So a much more remote location,
not within --

CANDY TAPER: Right, it was not within, right.

MS. CORRADO: When -- I have to say, I have
some real concerns about the, even the reenactment gunshots
in a fairly built-up area. Can you -- what is your plan if
there's any panic or concern from neighbors or anybody
attending? This is a touchy subject these day.

CANDY TAPER: It is. We have fliers designed
which we will put within the neighborhood completely door to
door. We intend to notify, were given permission to do so,
so that we've given them advance notice that this is going to
happen and happen within this time period. And, of course,
we will sit with the Brighton Police Department if we're
given permission.

MS. CORRADO: Do you have security plans for
the visitors at this point or are you waiting until you
discuss with Brighton Police what sort of approach you should take to security?

CANDY TAPER: We'll wait until we talk to them, yes. The only thing we have in place right now is the fire protection.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Just along those lines, what happens if we approve everything except for the noise, the potential noise ordinance violation. I guess it wouldn't be a violation if we approve it, but that issue, does the reenactment go elsewhere or they perform without gunshots?

CANDY TAPER: They will perform this year without any gunshots, they will not return.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: And the intent is that this would be a recurrent thing at this location?

CANDY TAPER: Yes.

MS. CORRADO: One other question and this will be my last one, I'm sorry. So this is the Union Army and is there any potential for having the other side appear? Is that any part of the reenactment?

CANDY TAPER: It is part of it and the reenactors actually play either role and they have to rehearse either role in the costumes for which. So in this union troop some will be Confederate, some will be Union.
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MS. CORRADO: And displaying period flags and --

CANDY TAPER: Yes. I didn't even ask that, I assumed yes, because there's a separate camp, yes. So I'm sure there will be a southern flag.

MS. SCHWARTZ: My questions have been asked.

MS. WATSON: I'm trying to understand, there's 40 reenactors but only eight guns?

CANDY TAPER: Correct.

MS. WATSON: And eight guns will be fired six times per hour in the course of four hours. You will have that schedule of gunfire distributed how far of a radius of neighbors?

CANDY TAPER: As much as you tell me, but generally when we do an advertisement we cover to the expressway, all up Highland and, over to St. Thomas More so that.

MS. WATSON: So that's door to door?

CANDY TAPER: Yes.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Do you ever go down the streets that are off of Highland --

CANDY TAPER: Yes, that whole section.

MS. SCHWARTZ: -- towards East and then
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towards Esplanade as well?

      CANDY TAPER: Yes.

      CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay, so other questions?

      MR. DiSTEFANO: I just have one. The tents, how many tents? Are they multiperson tents or does everybody have individual ones?

      CANDY TAPER: They're individual.

      MR. DiSTEFANO: So you're going to have 40 tents basically on the site?

      CANDY TAPER: I think they only have 33, but some people are going to sleep inside.

      CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Are we set? Thank you very much.

      Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak regarding this application? There being none, then the Public Hearing is closed.

APPLICATION 3A-05-18

3A-05-18 Application of Home Power Systems, contractor, and Stephen Sanko, owner of property located at 88 Golfside Parkway for an Area Variance from Section 203-2.1B(6) to allow a standby emergency generator to be located in a side yard in lieu of the rear yard behind the house as required by code. All as described on application and plans
KEN STAVALONE: Good evening, how are you tonight? My name is Ken Stavalone, I work for Home Power Systems and I'm here tonight on behalf of Dr. Steve Sanko who resides at 88 Golfside Parkway.

We are asking for a variance tonight in relief from the requirement for the generator to be located in the rear of the home and to move the generator to the side of the home at the residence. The rear of the home of the residence there has an entrance to a nice solarium off the side of the house as well as a paved concrete area that overlooks a lily pond. And it would be obviously kind of in the way of the living space in the area there if it was placed on the concrete patio.

On the side of the house where we're proposing to locate the generator from the front of the house it's blocked by an oak tree that has to be 300 years old. It's one of the biggest oaks I've ever seen. As well as a metal fence, you can't see through the fence but there is a metal fence there as well. With installation we're proposing that all the lines will be underground so they will be -- the gas and the electric lines will be run underground to the generator. So there will be no unsightly gas lines or
anything running out, you know, five foot to the house.

   It meets all the side setback requirements and all of the other requirements laid out. And as far as the sound goes the way the generator will be located the exhaust and the sound will be going out towards 490 because of the property's located right, it backs up to 490. So the sound will be going that way and not out towards the other houses.

   And then to the, I believe it would be the east of the home's location is a stone wall that separates, it's about a five-foot high stone wall. It looks like it's been there forever, that separates the house -- or the lot line from the other next residence next to that home.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Questions? And what would you say is the distance to the closest structure from where this unit will be placed?

KEN STAVALONE: Yeah, absolutely. So within the New York State Code it has to be five feet from any windows or openings, so we would be five feet from any windows or openings. There's some big windows because that's the area of the house that has the solarium there, so we keep five feet from there.

   The units are actually rated to be within 18 inches but we never typically put them that close. So it
probably would be a minimum of five foot, and again there
would be no lines coming out because everything is going to
be underground installation.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: How about to the
neighboring structures, what would be the closest structure?

KEN STAVALONE: The closest structure, if I
had to estimate probably 80 foot. Those are big old lots
there.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Where's the "H" vacuum
at on the house in relation to where the generator is going?

KEN STAVALONE: The "H" vac unit is piled in
the corner of the rear of the house by the garage.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: And explain again why
the generator couldn't go in that?

KEN STAVALONE: So to meet the five-foot
requirement from any structures or windows it would be placed
on the patio where the "H" vacuum unit is it's pretty much
tied up to there, yeah.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Any other questions?

Thank you.

Is there anyone in the audience that would
like to speak regarding this application? There being none, then the Public Hearing is closed.

APPLICATION 3A-06-18

3A-06-18 Application of Faith Bible Church, owner of property located at 1095 East Henrietta Road for an Area Variance from Section 205-8 to allow a church building addition to be constructed 17.5 ft. from a side (north) lot line in lieu of the minimum 50 ft. required by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

BETSY BRUGG: Good evening, my name is Betsy Brugg, I'm an attorney with the firm Woods Oviatt Gilman and I'm here on this application. With me is Pastor Brado and Bob Dyjak from the church, and Matt Tomlinson from Marathon Engineers.

So I think this is somewhat of a straightforward application for an area variance. We have the plan here, you should have it in your packets as well. This property is used as a church. The church acquired it from another church that used to be located there. They did not build this building. It's about 10,000-square feet in size.

The congregation is happy at this location but they don't have recreation space for programs for their teens and kids.

As you probably know, you know, kids
activities often involve running around, they need some space so they can have more physical activity and really have a lot more flexibility in terms of recreational activities for their congregation.

So they're proposing a 7,600-square feet addition that includes a vestibule area. So the recreation space with storage and all is approximately 7,200 feet. They do have relatively expansive amount of space on the property. However, in order to really get this to work from the engineering standpoint, they do need a side setback.

So this is the side setback we're talking about. You should a copy of a letter from Flaun Management that owns the adjacent property. They don't have any problem with this variance and they support the application. They would certainly be the only potentially impacted party and they are fine with it.

As far as what we need to demonstrate to the Board, we've addressed the standards for the granting of the are variance in writing, but I will just go through it briefly to the extent that we're looking at the benefit to the applicant as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety, and welfare of the community. Obviously, this is a church, in order for the church to conduct activities and be
successfully using their existing building they need to expand their space in order to meet the needs of their congregants. So there's a huge benefit to the church. The success of the church is also a benefit to the community. There's no adverse impact to the community by the granting of this area variance. There's no other neighbor that would be adversely impacted.

As far as the criteria, it's consistent with the character of the neighborhood, it's a church and it will continue to be operated as a church, nobody will be adversely impacted by the location of this particular addition. It will not have significant visibility from the street and it's relatively, you know, setback.

Whether there's any other means feasible, other than the granting of the variance, and we believe there really is no alternative to this variance. If we are to be able to build something that's suitable we have some engineering issues which Matt can get into if you have specific questions. We would be significantly impacting the availability and convenient parking for congregants and impacting access to natural light and things like that, as well as there's some drainage issues.

We don't feel we have really a good
alternative to this particular variance. The variance is not substantial, we're not looking just at the number of feet when we're talking about substantiality, we're looking at the whether it's substantial in its nature and its impact, whether it's meaningful and looking at each application on its own merits I would say that there's no significant impact. So it's not really a substantial variance to the extent of the impact for the nature of the variance in this particular case with this particular property.

There's no adverse impact on any physical or environmental conditions. It will be subject to Architectural Review, Planning Board will also get to look at this and approve it. So that will be looked at as well. And is the variance -- is the hardship itself created. And again, they didn't develop this property, they're working with existing conditions and existing building. They're really trying to put on the nicest and most suitable addition onto the building. So I think we meet the criteria. We'd be happy to answer any questions or give you more information, but I hope that that is satisfactory.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Questions?

MS. DALE: I was just going to say, it's -- did the applicant consider if the purpose is to have space
for the youth and recreational activities that could be achieved by playing outside, you know, a playground?

BETSY BRUGG: Well, I think they do religious-type activities, they are not all just running around. I think they need space where they can do, you know, circles and things inside of the building. Obviously, weather is sometimes an issue and some of their activities are really more engaging than just running around, so.

MS. DALE: Okay.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Just to clarify, it was in your application, but there's already a garage on site that doesn't comply with the setbacks. In fact, it's close to the lot line where the proposed addition is.

BETSY BRUGG: Yes, there's a small garage and it's located right here. It actually --

MATT TOMLINSON: It's roughly the same setback yes, 16 or 17 feet.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Just say your name again.

MATT TOMLINSON: I'm Matt Tomlinson from Marathon Engineering. And just to clarify the first question, night services at the church are Thursday night and it's their main night service, if you will. So obviously daylight and everything else becomes an issue as far as
outside activities.

MS. DALE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: So could one of you describe just on a seven-day-a-week basis what the use of this thing is going to be as far as what times of the day and what types of things, how often?

PASTOR BOB BRADO: Sure. Good evening, I'm Bob Brado, B-r-a-d-o, I'm the pastor of Faith Bible Church. So Sunday mornings we have most of our people there from 10:00 a.m. to noon-ish, 12 to 12:30-ish. And our children at that time are in their classrooms and our children's space, we've just outgrown our children space. Thursday evenings is a program geared toward our teenagers and also our youth 4 years old up to 6th grade, so all the way through. That is a combined educational program along with game time, so both are utilized. And that would be 7:00 p.m. to about 9:00 p.m. on Thursdays. Those are the main times that we meet Sundays and Thursdays.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: What will happen with the space the rest of the time?

PASTOR BOB BRADO: Honestly, we don't have any plans for it. I don't foresee anything major right now. It is a gymnasium-type thing there could be some programs,
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activities, you know, during the summer but we don't have any current plans for that.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: And with the mission of the church which was discussed earlier, then there probably wouldn't be a likelihood that you would lease or allow or whatever other users to come in?

PASTOR BOB BRADO: Actually, sir, we've not done that. We're really not looking to do that. We don't need to do that from a financial standpoint. And it just gets complicated when you have outside --

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: We're just trying to understand for the record how you will operate it.

PASTOR BOB BRADO: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: All right, very good. Questions over here? Anything else? Thank you.

Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak regarding this application? There being none, then the Public Hearing is closed.

APPLICATION 3A-07-18

3A-07-18 Application of Brighton 12 Corners Associates, LLC, owner of property located at 1881 Monroe Avenue, for an Area Variance from Section 205-12 to allow for 88 on-site parking spaces to accommodate existing uses and
the establishment of a 3,190-square foot urgent care facility where 129 parking spaces are required by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

JAMES CRITICOSE: Good evening everybody, my name is James Criticose, I'm a project engineer B & E Associates. I'm here on behalf of Brighton Twelve Corners Associates, LLC, for the property located at 1881 Monroe Avenue, which is located on the western side of the Twelve Corners intersection. Also here with me this evening is Fred Rinaldi of Brighton Twelve Corners Associates.

We had submitted an application requesting an area variance to the property for Town Code Section 205 for the off street parking regulations. The area variance we have requested will allow for a reduction in the required parking from 129 spaces to 88 parking spaces, which is a reduction in 41 spaces.

The required number of parking spaces calculated per the existing uses in the proposed medical office use, the new urgent care facility they're proposing located on the property. Previously a variance was granted by the Zoning Board on May 4, 2016, which allowed for a reduction in the required parking from 118 required spaces to 88 spaces, which is the current number of space located on
the site and then continued to be maintained.

   The site is completed, developed, and no site
improvements are proposed for the new facility, only sod
improvements to the existing building. Which we've already
met with and received approval from the Architectural Review
Board at their last meeting.

   At the time the variance was granted
previously the proposed use for the vacant space remaining in
the building was not known and was allocated at 11 spaces at
a rate of one space per 300-square feet. Per the Town Code,
medical office use requires a parking ratio of one space to
105 square feet, which require a total of 22 parking spaces
dedicated for this new urgent care facility.

   As such, the request to reduce the parking
will be an additional 11 spaces beyond what is currently
granted for the property. To support the request Twelve
Corners Associates had a parking study of the property
completed by Burgman Associates which was included with the
materials submitted for your review. The study analyzed the
88 parking spaces contained on the property and also included
an additional six spaces to Aja Noodle which straddle the
property line but are associated with the Aja Noodle
business, so they were studied.
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The study observed the parking utilization on January 26th from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. and the study showed that during the peak period of utilization which occurred at 1:15 in the afternoon only 50 percent of the 94 parking spaces studied were occupied, or such that 47 spaces were available to be utilized.

Parking projections for the urgent care facility were created through consultation with the future tenant facility who also operates several other urgent care facilities in the Rochester region, as well as the ITE trip generation manual.

The parking commands provided by the future tenant included both employee and patient loadings and have been incorporated into the study. The parking study included projections for the full development of the property which estimates and approximate an additional 24 spaces may be needed at the facility.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Sir, can you slow it down a little bit?

JAMES CRITICOSE: Yes, I'm sorry. As I mentioned the parking study included projections for the full development of the property which are projected to be an additional 24 spaces during the peak loading time which
occurs at 1:00 p.m. As indicated in the study, 47 spaces were available at that time and therefore even producing the 24 max projected at this loading period but still have 23 approximate spaces available at the full build out.

The letter of intent that was submitted with the application discussed each of the six factors that you need to consider for the area variance. I'll just go over them very briefly. The first was that it would not result in a substantial change in the character of the neighborhood. As we're not proposing any site improvements or changes to the existing facility, there's going to be no impacts to the site or existing neighbors.

Additionally, there are no urgent care facilities in this area of Brighton, so being able to provide in this new facility would be a benefit to the community and the residents in the town.

For the second point, the explaining why the difficulty in necessitating the variance cannot be solved in another solution. As I mentioned, the site is completely developed, we don't have the opportunity to create additional parking on the site. But, again, based on the parking study we don't believe it is necessary to support all of the existing proposed use.
How substantial is the area request? As I mentioned, we're requesting a reduction from the required number of spaces of 129 for all of the uses to 88 spaces for a variance of 41. Again, this is only an additional 11 spaces being requested from what was previously granted for the facility.

This is the minimum request necessary to bring us to be in compliance with the existing uses and the Town Code. And this will be consistent with the remaining surrounding properties, again, we're not proposing any site improvements, access is still going to be maintained exactly how it functions today with access points being served through the adjacent property of Elmwood Avenue, as well as Monroe Avenue.

Park traffic enters through that and can enter into the facility and park where they choose. There's no reserved areas for any of the businesses. All businesses on the property share all of the parking spaces.

The last point is describing how the difficulty, which leads to the variance request was not self-created. Again, the code is dictating the required number of parking spaces being based on uses. However, based on the parking study and the review of the uses that are
present in the facility, there's sufficient parking to support everything that's is existing in the proposed lot.

In summary, the information we provided in the parking study shows there is sufficient parking at the site. If you guys have any questions in regards to the parking study or the operations of the facility, myself or Fred will be happy to answer them.

MS. DALE: I do. So for your parking generation table summary, in order to, you know, something like the number of employees on the site per day, I would think it would be pretty easy to confirm and check with the company that's planning on running this business. But as far as the maximum number of patients per hour could you talk a little bit about how you came up with it?

JAMES CRITICOSE: Sure. So like I said, the future tenant operates several other urgent care facilities in the Rochester region, most of those facilities are approximately double the size of this as well. They provided us with patient loadings on a given day. The patient loading for these type of facilities typically bimodal. They typically peak at 9:00 a.m. right when they open up and then again after the work hours, 6:00 to 7:00, right when people are getting out of work.
The loading at all of those facilities constructed in towns, you know, Greece, Webster, typically had at max, you know, seven to eight patients. With the reduction in the size of this facility, they don't anticipate as many patients. Another factor that they are incorporating into this facility which isn't part of a lot of the other ones is they're incorporating online electronic cueing system. So you can basically go online and cue your spot in line so which will also help to reduce the number of parking.

MS. DALE: So I do wonder though about the expected credit, like, do you really think they're going to be walking to an urgent care? It seems a little -- I don't think someone is going to ride a bicycle to urgent care. I'm just wondering a little bit about the estimate because that seems not very smart.

FRED RINALDI: Good evening, Fred Rinaldi, Brighton Twelve Corners, I wanted just to respond to that because we have with this application and a prior application for QDOBA went through a pretty intense parking and traffic analysis and captured a lot of data with the QDOBA application two years ago. And then we reengaged and expanded the scoping document to bring us current with this application specifically. One of the neat things that's
happened over the last five years with regards to parking and traffic analysis has been an incredible illusion of their sim models and they are able to get incredibly specific to the operation and the function. Because this is a Rochester regional instillation, there was incredible background data including data provided by their operators. And Chris Flynn, who is the operator for these units in our market is available to speak on the specifics.

But believe it or not, what you find is bizarre patterns. And as a landlord where I have almost every type of product in the market -- I'm kind of a statistics junkie to that effect -- and you will actually have people who show up, who may walk there for a nonserious something. And there was an allocation in the sim model that Burgman used that's used everywhere in the country that we didn't want to excommunicate from the study because they show that.

The outlier, which we consider that an anomaly wasn't serious enough for us to go back and understand exactly what that meant because we do feel we have an abundance of parking, even in the peak hours. I didn't want to eliminate that because as we submit these studies to the public, they are public information, I wanted to be accurate
and consistent with the methodology by which the same
practice would take place in Texas or California.

So believe it or not you will see somebody who
will walk to an urgent care facility because of the
nonserious injury or symptom that they have the ability to
walk.

MS. DALE: Okay.

MS. SCHWARTZ: What are your hours of
operation?

FRED RINALDI: The facility --

JAMES CRITICOSE: The hours are 9:00 a.m. to
9:00 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: That would be seven days a
week?

JAMES CRITICOSE: Correct.

MS. WATSON: Did they take into consideration
at all any increase in traffic from the CoreLife in the old
post office building?

JAMES CRITICOSE: No. We did an initial
study -- or a brief review of the ITE trip manuals once we
became aware of that CoreLife Eatery was going to be in the
facility based on the parking that's available on that
property and on the proposed use as reviewed for the ITE trip
 manual. They have more than sufficient parking over there to support their needs.

FRED RINALDI: The other practical application of the way that our parking facilities are set up, you'll see that we wrap the outer edges of Elmwood and Winton and Monroe. Rochester has very real intricacies in the way that they say it's about convenience. So it's highly unlikely that we will see participants of the rear establishments utilizing this parking facility to then walk to their front door.

So we benefit a lot by having that feature. The town has been very good about supporting a shared parking environment. That facility acts like a larger shopping destination. We consider ourselves a part of Brighton Commons. We like that, we like the cross shopping.

We allow some bad habits to take place where some of the businesses that are not part of Brighton Twelve Corners Associates. They park their vehicles for advertising, we try to be a good neighbor. The presence of CoreLife Eatery, we view that as a huge win for the tenants. And we don't perceive an impact to the immediate access to parking for our tenants.

I can promise you that my biggest concern
after life, safety, is to health, longevity of those businesses because those businesses, in business terms, the collateral allowing to finance and improve facilities. And this is something we have been working on for a long time to kind of starting a new chapter and get out of the memories of what it was, the Rite Aid era.

MS. CORRADO: Relating to parking and operation, and I think you addressed this in when you explained the parking, but I may have missed it, as you went over a lot. Did you say that there will be reserved spots for patients? No?

JAMES CRITICOSE: No.

MS. CORRADO: So somebody is in need of urgent care, not emergency room critical but it's certainly concerning and they're navigating a tricky parking lot and you anticipate that that's going to be all right with reduced spaces for them to be able to find a place and get into the facility without adding more distress to the situation?

FRED RINALDI: So we went through a pretty intense review with the operator and the tenant. We've gone -- you probably can imagine how difficult it is finding an operator that fits with the reality of our infrastructure there and when we found this --
MS. CORRADO: Answer my question --

FRED RINALDI: When we found this operator
they -- every element had a higher sensitivity and we studied
that at great length. We found that in the worst cases which
we consider peak hours, there wasn't an environment that
would allow immediate access to the front door.

The nice thing about the Monroe elevation
place, it's very visible and easy to navigate. And we can do
this going in with ESL because they had trained us to what
they envisioned their new existence to look like. And a lot
of it was low density, high utilization of the drive-thru,
features like that. So we always find ample parking.

MS. CORRADO: I still want to press on this
though. So I've got my sick kid, the kid's crying, I'm
rattled, I pull in there, it's my first time there, it's in a
peak dinner hour QDOBA, Aja Noodle, and I pull in, I'm not
finding a spot and now I have to circulate around, it's a
tricky circulation and I have to go run around the back and
try all over again.

You're sure that there's not the opportunity
for a couple of reserved spots for this facility? And I
recognize that that would have an impact on the overall
parking situation, but seems --
FRED RINALDI: My request would be that maybe as if we are so fortunate, a condition of the approval would allow me the opportunity to respond to that. If we found that there were instances where we're running into the situation you described that I have the ability at my expense to come to the Town and ask for a permit to install a reserved spot. I can promise you both as a owner of -- about a third of our portfolio is medical and we have several pediatrics units. I'm also a father of a 22-month-old son who leads with his head everywhere. And every pediatrics unit that I have visited has not had shared parking.

I've also witnessed in my history in operating medical facilities that if somebody is in duress they will park wherever they want to get their family member, patient, whoever into the space. My hope is that through the planning, the coordination of the Town things that don't get utilized heavily on our site like the handicapped parking and other features that offer an opportunity, those will function as flex environments where they may not be --

MS. CORRADO: That's problematic.

MR. DOLLINGER: I see what you're saying, but I don't think you've explained the down side. It seems to me that we can all acknowledge that you are able to put two
spots in front of the -- there would be a benefit to having
two spots in front of the urgent care facility that said, you
know, urgent care. That has to have a benefit and I
questioned, I just wanted an explanation of what's the
downside doing.

FRED RINALDI: So in response to that, if the
operator has not identified the need, if the Board was moved
to allowing to install reserved parking, two spots, in front
of their immediate entry, then I will happy to do that.

MR. DOLLINGER: Interesting. So I also
thought when I looked at it, you could actually put it down,
it doesn't have to be right in front because that's close to
QDOBA, but somewhere in between that urgent care and the ESL,
those spots have to be open on a semiregular basis. Because
I agree with you, that the ESL is not a big demand for
parking, particularly on that side of the building.

So most spaces it seems to me, I mean, I'm a
frequent flier at this place or by it, but, you know, those
spaces are open a lot. It seems to me you could not impact
the rest of the, you know, by putting a couple of spots at --

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: We could probably discuss
this issue a little later.

MR. DI STEFANO: I don't really think this has
an impact on the variance.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: I think it's a discussion we can have, but I think it's fair to suggest for the record that they're saying if we had some thought like that and they would attempt to accommodate it.

Did you have any other questions?

MS. CORRADO: Yeah. I am not sure if it impacts the parking need or not, but I'm just curious to know oftentimes, from time to time somebody will get to urgent care and it will turn out that they need more critical care, is there thought about things like ambulance, arrival and pick up and transport of the patient from a location like this?

FRED RINALDI: So any time I come to the town and ask for any change to an existing anything, future care, it will go through a code review. When I pull a building permit, there's a life, safety analysis. So all of our lanes are of the width allows a pass through by a fire truck or ambulatory. And we believe with both the ingress and egress both on Elmwood and Monroe, that we have the circulation to accommodate an escalated situation. Again, which would be a rare instance, but absolutely we would be able to accommodate.
I mentioned about three or four minutes ago that life, safety review and my civil engineer can tell you the first element on every initial site plan development, it just is. So we have all -- we are to code in all of the safety features available to us.

I just wanted to clarify as testimony to your prior point, I am absolutely willing at my expense without any hesitation if the Board seems deems it necessary to install exclusive spots for the urgent care drop off without question so that the mechanism by which that would be elected would be up to your discretion.

MS. CORRADO: That doesn't, Rick --

MR. DiSTEFANO: No, it becomes a policing matter who's going to police it. Reserved parking spaces just tend to add more issues than they do resolve issues.

MR. DOLLINGER: I'm not sure I get that.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Again, that's not for this discussion.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Let's stick to questions here. Do you have any others?

MS. CORRADO: I think I'm good.

MS. WATSON: I have a question. I'm just wondering if there's going to be an entrance or exit out of
Brighton Zoning Board of Appeals 3/7/18

the rear of the urgent care facility along the back driveway?

FRED RINALDI: Yes. So they have with QDOBA a
shared vestibule it allows --

MS. WATSON: Is it an emergency exit only or
do you expect anyone to come in there?

FRED RINALDI: Patients can't come in, but if
there's an emergency and a patient can't get out Monroe
Avenue we have all the signage that in an emergency they can
get out. It has to be a push --

MS. WATSON: Nobody's going to park at that --

FRED RINALDI: No patients would be entering.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: A quick question on the
traffic study. Did you consider doing more than one day? I
don't think that the parking is usually very busy. I am not
used to seeing traffic studies on just one day and time where
they take a parking calculation. And the other issue, I'll
say my memory is fading already, QDOBA was open?

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: It was early, how long had
it been open in January?

FRED RINALDI: Just over six or seven months,
but the analysis makes several assumptions, so I present
almost three nights a week to several municipalities and
traffic is always a very important conversation, very
important subject. I had to learn the methodologies used because they provide me with scoping documents that come with very expensive lines at the bottom. I said, so what are you accomplishing, how are you servicing the concerns of the town and the community?

So it is actually common practice to identify -- and remember that we had significant base of data to build the scoping document off of because it was captured with QDOBA. So we identified the highest level of participation through the work week. And we used that full day to capture. And that was identified through the Bergman study.

My company, we acquired, billed, and managed the projects in perpetuity and I have an on-site manager Teresa Vigianti who is in charge of this. She operates, I consider her to be very good and she is always collecting data because we want to be in front of the concern before our tenants call us, because that's our style.

We have found that the Bergman study which was formal by engineer, and our practical application of the data with use of the project, we were consistent with the needs and demands of this application.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: So just be specific
thought, in the first Bergman study that was done for QDOBA, you identified Fridays as being the peak day for parking?

FRED RINALDI: Correct. Food really is driving the piece with this. There's a slight adjustment with the utilization of the bank. But by large, it's almost completely plausible. The food operations have a little bit of unpredictability so they build assumptions into it.

So we used those to create worst case scenario. These were built off of a worst case scenario. Even in the worst case scenario we have a significant margin of service available to accommodate this need. That also includes you'll see there's a line that includes increases in utilization over the next five years, we're still in incredible shape at that point.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: But speaking of that, the requested variance is to reduce it from 22 spaces for this use, not to be in consideration with shared parking, but this is taking it from 22 to 11. And your parking generation basically says that you'll exceed that by year three. That you'll actually be using 12 spaces in year three, 13 in four and 15 in five.

FRED RINALDI: That's what we're asking for, but the model shows that we have in excess of 23. Just to
service the parking is --

MR. DiSTEFANO: If I can just interject here, why do you think that there are that many available parking spaces at the site with full capacity, given the fact that we know the banking industry has changed a little bit. There's not as many people that visit a branch. Where are we getting this large reduction in number? Are the uses in there just not generating much traffic? Nobody's not meeting their projections?

I get a little concerned that QDOBA goes out for whatever reason and you put maybe a family diner in there that really takes off, now we're banging against those numbers. So I guess my question is, why is there so much excess parking?

FRED RINALDI: The simple answer is that the code, when we bring an application in we have to apply it against the Town Code.

MR. DiSTEFANO: And banking, I can understand that. The code is probably a little high for the banking and especially the way the banking is done today. But with the UPS, which is a basic retail-type use and the two restaurants at one space for every two seats, I don't think that's a high number of parking that's require for those. So where is the
discrepancy here?

FRED RINALDI: We feel that the Town retirements are higher than would be demanded by the mix tenants. And even if we swap out a 3,000 square feet tenant, we don't see a future scenario that imposes an environment where it's no longer able to accept patrons, comfortably. And you have to remember that that scenario I just described where I can't service my tenants with our parking infrastructure means I'm probably not going to be able to lease the space out very easily.

So I am of the firm belief that we have incredible excess to accommodate our application today and then any transfer or shuffling of the tenants in the future. Because the spaces remember are, I don't have five, six, seven, 10,000-square foot blocks anymore. I have 2,000, 800, 3,000-square foot blocks.

JAMES CRITICOSE: Kind of in addition to that, Rick, some of the uses in the facility do not peak at the same hours. So like I mentioned the urgent care facility is typically a bi-model peak, so they're peaking, you know, the highest demand is typically right in the morning at 9:00 a.m. when they open. If facilities like the bank are typically closed at the dinner hour when, you know, the QDOBA or the
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Aja Noodle are also on peaks, and they typically peak, restaurant facilities also peak in the afternoon like 12:00 to 1:00, which is typically one of the lowest times for the urgent care facility.

So the parking study shows it as looking at the utilization across the site. We're not just taking the peak hour traffic generated for each of those and compiling them all into one time. We're, you know, looking at how the distribution of the utilization occurs throughout the period of the day. So based on the uses that, you know, are proposed and existing, the study, you know, clearly shows that we should be able to support all of these practices.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. I have a couple questions. More operationally, so I don't know if you guys can answer them as well as the gentleman from the urgent care could answer them, but I'll ask them and you guys can decide who should answer them. The first one is, you made a comment earlier that interested me that because this facility is approximately 3,000 square feet and most of the operations that they operate also are larger than you said, 5- or 6,000 square feet. Again, once the name urgent care is on there people are aware there's a place that you can get urgent care services. If they need it they will show up, because most
people don't understand how many square feet are in an urgent care, or how many are in this urgent care, versus any other urgent care. So how are we suggesting that the amount of people will be limited by the 3,000 square feet? Again, they must have data for these other facilities that say for 6,000 square feet there's this many patients an hour. And to just divide by two and dial it down so you wouldn't be responsible. So how is that developed, I guess. That's one question.

And then the second question would be, could we get a little idea of how that facility is designed, how many patient areas are there? How many patients could be actually worked on per se, at one time? We see how many employees there are, but I don't want to assume what those employees do. That there are receptionists, nurse, there are NP, there are PA.

FRED RINALDI: To your first point, about a decade ago when the hospitals, University of Rochester and Rochester General, at the time when they put out an initiative that offered two things, take pressure off of the main institutions, the emergency rooms especially, and also to create a more hyper world installation to service communities in a micro way.
So they went through a huge initiative and they started opening up 6,000-7,000-square foot urgent cares throughout Monroe County. While that was happening, like anything that has incredible growth, there were private practices that came in, Five Star is an example. When they started installing 5-, 6-, and 7,000-square foot units, what has happened in the last few years is that the hospitals now have said, we're going to take a far more micro approach to these communities.

And now that they have all of this data and they have identified that these environments where they're instituting these 3,000 to 3,800, that's the range, they're truly feeling -- they're filling a highly identified niche or void, we will call it.

So they went through an incredible study to make sure that the -- what they call it primary trader, the areas where they're going to be servicing -- that this was a format both in layout, size, and access, that would accommodate that need. And I can have Chris Flynn speak specifically to the operation.

CHRIS FLYNN: Sure. Good evening, Chris Flynn with Rochester Regional Media Care. We have developed this model based on existing data that we had of the original
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three centers that were built in the Rochester area along with our location in Buffalo, New York, which there's five. The trend within urgent care is to go to smaller centers. When we built the original three centers here there was very little competition.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Where are they, just for the record?

CHRIS FLYNN: The three in Rochester?

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Yes.

CHRIS FLYNN: Greece, Henrietta and Webster, our three original sites. Now we have added two sites, one in Penfield, most recently Irondequoit and now this would actually be the sixth location that we're looking at, with more on the horizon.

We assist in operating centers of this magnitude nationwide, so we have data from other locations across the country, California, Texas, Florida, Tennessee, those types of locations, and the trend, as Fred said, has been to go to these smaller models, get out into the neighborhoods. And the hospital system is really getting on board with these models as we've worked in this joint venture arrangement with them because they want to get the low acute of the cases. So folks that really can't physically mobilize
to get into spaces, this is not where they need to go. But, you know, for low acute cases, they get them out of the emergency room so that they're freed up to handle more critical cases. This has been the answer.

There's also a cost factor, as most folks have seen, your ER co-pays are continuing to climb up year after year. An ER bill of which we run also of $15- to $1800 compared to here is much lower, so a couple hundred bucks. So the insurance carriers have gotten on board with these programs and that's some of the drive at the hospitals that had to move to these types of systems.

Staffing models are different at these locations than they would be at a medical office facility. For example, a lot of the registration takes place with an automated process. The quicker system that we spoke to earlier assists with some of that patient registration. They also get repeat business, so there's not a need to register again once you're on board in the system. We have good repeat business right on this part of this. So that reduces the amount of staff that we have to have to operate one of the facilities efficiently.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: I think part of it was that we were kind of equating the number of patients per hour
to how big the center was. But the neighbors won't know how big the center is compared to other ones, so is that model of how many patients you expect to get per hour, is that based on the neighborhood these centers are going in, the population, the survey, the radius as to where other urgent cares are, or is it really just based on the square footage? Because that's sort of hard to --

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Yeah, it doesn't really make a lot of sense.

CHRIS FLYNN: So we have seen a decrease in volumes of the larger centers because of the amount of competition that's in the marketplace. So as that's decreased we've lowered the amount of space that we have to treat patients because there's more opportunities.

So it's a smaller model. The real trend has been towards, and you don't have them in this area, but a Wegmans, for example, in other parts of the country their equivalency in other parts put in small PA midlevel provider type of facilities inside of the larger retail locations. And that's really the competition that's coming to the marketplace as they've developed those out. Walgreens, CVS, Kroger, which is a Wegmans equivalent in different parts of the country, that is the marketplace they've gone to, and
they are doing smaller locations. Two exam rooms staffed by
two individuals maybe four or five, and that's where the
competition goes. We are trying to make sure that we are
positioned correctly in the market as those start to come
into the area, and that will pick up. We just can't sustain
the current model that we have as far as the size.

FRED RINALDI: And a specific response to
answer your question. So in addition to the hospital's data,
they engage a market consultant professional, in this case
these guys use CB Richard Ellis, which is one of the largest
in the market. James Keenan is their rep. What they do is
they create sicodem models that do distances, total
locations, they'll take census data, there's a lot that gets
built in. And that's a segment of the site qualification
that is pushed off to a consultant professional like CB.

And that's one of the reasons we were excited
about this because CB has an incredible reputation servicing
successfully these types of installations and we've worked
with them quite a bit in the past. So it's a combination of
what you heard Chris describe and then a very intense market
study that does primary trade rings, secondary trade rings,
and it goes through the municipalities and they'll pull units
that are in permanent that haven't been built yet, so they
future cast a little bit. So it's a combination of quite a bit of data.

CHRIS FLYNN: It's also based on actual daytime traffic, so what's the occupancy of an area during the day versus the occupancy at night because that can be quite different as folks leave and go to work, kids go to school.

MR. DOLLINGER: That's my question, a little bit in my mind. And I guess it's somewhat tangential, but I'm wondering, I'm concerned in a way. I mean, I think there's a huge population that is going to be using this particular urgent care. As soon as you put that in there and people drive -- first of all, thousands of cars drive by there all of the time. It's got to be one of the highest traffic places in the county. And every one is going to see it and it seems to me there's a huge population base. I mean, when you look at -- do you know where the nearest --

MS. DALE: Pittsford Plaza.

MR. DOLLINGER: Right, Pittsford Plaza, but more the nearest one to all of the apartments up at the corner of Clinton and Elmwood and all of that.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: You also have to remember what the proximity to the hospital is from there. You have
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two major hospitals within a mile and a half, two miles.

MR. DOLLINGER: I'm not sure people are going to go to that. They're going to see this urgent care and they'll go there. Where's the nearest urgent care to the corner of, do you know where?

CHRIS FLYNN: Okay. It is Pittsford Plaza.

MR. DOLLINGER: So you're going to draw from a broad area of extremely dense people. There's a lot of population that lives within two miles of this, four miles of this particular urgent care. I just question if you are underestimating the volume.

MS. DALE: There's a bunch near by.

MR. DOLLINGER: Where's the one near McQuaid? This will be --

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: No, there's nothing.

MR. DOLLINGER: That's what I'm saying, that whole entire population, all down Town Line Road --

MR. DiSTEFANO: If you do a three-mile radius around this particular, you're hitting a lot of population.

MR. DOLLINGER: And this going to be the nearest and --

MS. DALE: All those people today are driving to Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road and Pittsford Plaza.
MR. DOLLINGER: They are. But the other interesting thing is, is Pittsford Plaza you don't know it's there unless somebody tells you it's there. This is going to be, hello this is your urgent care place right here. It's going to -- thousand of people are everyday going to drive by and say, oh, if I have a problem I'm going to that urgent care.

MS. DALE: I don't know that those other urgent cares are overflowing with people, that people are waiting for a billion hours.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Let's hold it for our deliberations.

MR. DOLLINGER: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Does anybody have a anymore factual questions of the applicant, as far as the operation, do we understand the operation?

MR. DOLLINGER: How many doctors are actually on site? Did we get that?

MR. DiSTEFANO: No, didn't hit that.

MR. DOLLINGER: There's two doctors typically at all times?

CHRIS FLYNN: A midlevel provider and a physician -- PA.
MR. DOLLINGER: Okay. And then there would be one staff coming in, so there's really three to four employees.

CHRIS FLYNN: Correct. It's small scale. And we adjust based on volume, so some of the increase in the analysis is actually based on the staffing as you grow.

One other point I would like to make is some of the existing centers that we have that are larger, when you look at the breakdown of exam rooms to waiting area, proportions were off balance. It's urgent care, you don't need a large waiting room. With the in quicker system, we've reduced the size of the waiting room because we really want to get folks into the back and really get them seen to get them out the door.

So it's a lot about flow and cycle analysis and the point about that we were making earlier about parking and what parking looks like, when you look at typical medical office building parking, we've all experienced that before. We deduce it for an extended period of time because they register a lot of appointments in and then they flow through their cue.

So we have more of a continuous cue flow that's related to it, which is more of a retail setting than
it is a medical office setting as folks come through.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. Is there any more specific questions? Thank you.

Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak regarding this application? There being none, then the Public Hearing is closed.

APPLICATION 3A-08-18

3A-08-18 Application of Yuri and Anna Joselson, owners of property located at 10 Chalet Circle, for an Area Variance from Section 205-2 to allow a building addition to extend 7 ft. into the 18.75 ft. side setback required by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

YURI JOSELSON: We need to build a first floor.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Could you say your name and address for the record?

YURI JOSELSON: Yuri Joselson, 10 Chalet Circle, Rochester, New York, 14618.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Thank you.

YURI JOSELSON: And we need to build a first floor bedroom with bathroom for a child with special needs. And after talking to architect and trying to put something
together we need this bedroom to protrude towards the property line 10 feet, at least, to make the bedroom handicapped accessible. And provide enough space to get into bathroom, closet, et cetera. That's pretty much what is asked for.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Are you going across the whole back? I mean, you've got a deck like off the kitchen.

YURI JOSELSON: Yes, deck will be gone.

MS. SCHWARTZ: So that's all going to be filled in with the interior footage and --

YURI JOSELSON: You have a copy?

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Yes, just visualize it.

YURI JOSELSON: If you take a look at -- the back of the house will be extended also 8 feet. Since we are building, we might just as well build it and make it more livable. Because right now kitchen is almost unlivable, three people cannot sit down for dinner and it's all cramped. You know, it's Brighton house, no surprises.

But bedroom needs to be -- it's like L-shape addition. I don't know how to say.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: I think that explains it. Could you talk about, you know, we can obviously see the shape of the lot, was there any other options studied besides
this one that could have potentially been considered?

YURI JOSELSION: We looked into probably building bedroom where the deck right now, talking to architect he said that's going to make house just ugly. It doesn't flow.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: You mean from an elevation perspective?

YURI JOSELSION: No, from the perspective of usability. And if house doesn't flow, it will not sell, it will have no value, it just money thrown out, pretty much.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. So that's really the only other thing that he's shown you as an option?

YURI JOSELSION: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Not going further to the other side of the lot or anything, that would not work related to the interior?

YURI JOSELSION: Other side of the lot is a garage. And it will be big bump out in the middle of the yard that will break down the property, it will be outright ugly.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Yeah, that's kind of important to us to understand why you selected this spot and why you couldn't have done something else.
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YURI JOSELSON: I agree.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Any other questions?

Thank you.

YURI JOSELSON: The only thing, the letters I received says protrude 7 feet into setback. It's not 7, it's 8. If you add the total is 21.8, if you take a look, they say 18.75. If you subtract 10 feet you will get 8 feet not 7. It's just an honest mistake of calculating.

MR. DiSTEFANO: There might be that fact that you actually have an extra foot. You're not at that point now, so there's an extra foot that you already have the ability to go into and then an additional 7 feet besides that. Because the house is not set at the required setback line, there's your required setback line, so you have that free, then it's after that that you have to add the additional footage into.

YURI JOSELSON: Now I understand what you meant.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Thank you.

Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak regarding this application? There being none, then the Public Hearing is closed.

APPLICATION 3A-09-18
3A-09-18 Application of John and Judy Teegardin, owner of property located at 201 Inwood Drive, for an Area Variance from Section 205-2 to allow for a fire damaged attached garage to be reconstructed with a 9.5 ft. side setback in lieu of the existing 13.1 ft. side setback where a 15 ft. side setback is required by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

RANDY PEACOCK: Good evening, I'm Randy Peacock, my office is 70 Linden Oaks, Suite 110. I'm here this evening with John and Judy Teegardin. Around the first of the year they had a pretty devastating fire that destroyed the garage portion of their house and did some considerable damage to the single story portion of the house, the first floor areas.

As a result of the fire we are going to be demolish -- the garage is gone already, that was in a dangerous condition. So that's been demolished. We also will end up having to take down the one-story portion of the house, there's a family room and a small connecting link as part of the kitchen. The main part of the house wasn't damaged by the fire, it was severely damaged by smoke. So that will be gutted out and rebuilt.

As part of their plans to rebuild the
Teegardins are looking to make some changes to the house. One of the changes was to try and work out a solution for the garage which they found quite annoying through the years that they've lived there. The house I believe, dates from the early 40s, it's had a 21'4" outside dimension garage, with brick veneer on it. So it's just around 20 foot inside for the width and about 20-foot deep. That's a very minimal sized garage given to the size of today's cars. And they've fought with it for the many years that they've lived there to squeeze two cars in, along with lawnmowers and bicycles and other equipment. As we all know, we use our garages for much for than just our cars.

What they would like to do is build a garage a little bit wider. We want to use two 9-foot doors, the previous garage had two 8-foot doors. The original garage sat at a setback of 13.1 feet off of the property line. So they were already shy by just under 2 feet from the required 15-foot setback.

We would like to take that garage from the 21'4" to 24'4" wide, adding about -- I'm sorry, I think it's 24'8", adding about three and a half feet to the width of it. That additional three and a half feet comes from going from the 8-foot door to a 9-foot door, there's two of them. And
then Section 602 of the building code, the residential building code requires that I build a portal frame on each side to brace those openings from lateral movement. That takes me to that 24'8" dimension, so that's the minimum dimension we feel we can do.

That gives you a little bit more space, that extra foot or two, gives a little bit more maneuverability in the garage and the ability to get in and out of the cars, and allows you a little bit of walk space around the vehicles. The garage would also extend back from its current 20-foot, it would go back 24 feet as well. So we're extending down the length of it as well.

We intend to replace the garage with the same type of consideration that was there. It will be a brick veneer, on the side walls there are two windows. The main difference will be the origin garage was just bare frame on the inside, so there was no fire resistance to those walls. The fire resistance will be improved by that because we end up drywalling the entire interior service of the garage. The ceiling and the walls all get dry walled.

The fire, from what they understood, originated from the garage, no one is sure exactly how it started, but it did do considerable damage to the house. It
also, because of the heat of the fire, it melted some of the vinyl siding off of the neighbor's house. So there was some damage just from melted siding on that adjacent house.

I think John Teegardin had a conversation with his neighbor, they were concerned about the possibility with coming the three feet closer to their property line about the danger of fire and spread of fire across the property lines. I just want to reinforce that this garage is safer than the previous one and it also has a brick wall here.

So the actual, the heat that came out of the roof of the garage is what melted that siding. And we are looking to try and contain that in case there ever was another fire there, certainly they're hoping that they will not have another house fire.

So we're looking to go from a .87 percent of the setback is what was there to go to a roughly .638. I'd like to calculate those out to the thousandths. But so it would be what we feel is a minimal increase to gain a maximum of usability in the garage itself.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: And just to clarify, the lot is only --

RANDY PEACOCK: One hundred feet wide.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: It's not that you have a
lot of -- side lots are minimal anyway.

RANDY PEACOCK: Right. That's one of the mitigating -- or one of the contributing factors here is that the lots are smaller, the subdivision was developed at a time prior to the current zoning ordinance.

I should point out as well that from a safety standpoint, the New York State Building Code allows me to build with combustible construction up to 5 feet from a property line. This actually will have a noncombustible exterior skin on it and it will be that 9.5 feet from the property line. So we are far exceeding what the minimum safety requirements of the New York State Building Code for residential code would be.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: And you said the neighbor was originally concerned about it getting closer because of the fire, but are there --

RANDY PEACOCK: They may have other concerns, I think they're here tonight so you will probably be able to hear from them.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Are any trees being removed to accommodate --

RANDY PEACOCK: No. There may be some tree damage, there's a large tree in the front of the yard that
Brighton Zoning Board of Appeals 3/7/18

the heat from the fire rising up through you can see some of the branches were scorched. I think they're waiting that out until the spring to see how the trees leaf out, and if there was any damage to them. So we may have to go back in and trim some of the trees. But for the most part, you know, we do not have to remove any at this point.

MS. SCHWARTZ: What will be the materials of the new roof?

RANDY PEACOCK: The roof is wood trusses with asphalt shingles on it. But, the difference being between the old garage and the new garage, is that the old garage had just open wood construction. So when a fire started in the garage, immediately it could catch that garage roof on fire. And given the age of the house, the fire separation between the garage and the house was not what it is required to be today, so it spread and went to the roof of house as well.

The way we resolve that today, I have to have a 20-minute separation between the house and the garage. That's usually done with a 5/8" type chips and board that lines the inside walls and ceiling of the garage. So I'm creating an envelope inside.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Right. But my concern is more for the neighbor next door, to be honest with you, because to
me that's serious damage and a fear.

RANDY PEACOCK: Oh, I understand the fear. I think from that aspect, the house burned once and the house has been there close to 70 years. So, you know, the likelihood that they have another fire is probably almost a zero. So and the damage that occurred was the vinyl siding was melted. And I just replaced some vinyl siding on the back of my house that was actually melted by sunlight, bouncing off a window. So vinyl siding is extremely susceptible to heat damage.

MS. SCHWARTZ: But a fire is a fire.

RANDY PEACOCK: I understand that. That's a very scary thing. And what I wanted you to know is that this house was built to a higher standard than what we were building in the 40s, when we do this repair and you won't have that risk like you had here.

Judy, the other thing I should point out, the brick veneer on this garage was still standing after the inside burnt out. So we had to knock it down because there was nothing supporting it. But that brick alone is an incredible barrier to heat for spreading across the property line.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Any other questions from the Board? Thank you.

Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak regarding this application? Sure.

STEVE ALEXANDER: Good evening, Steve Alexander, 215 Inwood Drive. I have some photos, I don't know if you --

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Sure, you can pass them around.

STEVE ALEXANDER: So we are next door neighbors to John and Judy Teegardin and we did have a front-row seat to that evening's fire. Without getting too dramatic about the evening, one of the things we kind of came away thinking about was that wider garage could pose a greater risk to us than it did that evening, to our home and to our personal safety.

We feel that we did sustain damage to the entire north side of our garage, which is in the photo. A window was cracked and I had damage to my vehicle. Come to find out the existing setback was already being encroached upon. So I thought to myself, if it had been respected would we have suffered less damage from the fire.

You know, the most important thing is we have
young children and in the event of another fire the task of evacuating two children, if my wife were away on business, which she is quite often, and if the fire had happened at 2:00 in the morning or 3:00 in the morning, would be greatly complicated by that fact.

We have spent a lot of money and time investigating fire safety in our own home and we've learned that fire alarms placed in a garage space are not effective due to temperature changes. And we have learned about the ineffectiveness of our own vinyl siding as a fire barrier from the outside.

I think that the proposed plan includes some windows in the garage, and from what I understand that would reduce the effectiveness of any fire barrier that the drywall adds to the property.

Our garage space that was damaged, ours actually happens to have living space above it, which we use right now as an office and a guest bedroom. But someday we're going to want to -- our children are probably going to want to sleep in that part of the house.

So it's just looking at the long term view of, you know, we've lived there three years, we want to live there for 30 years or more. We just feel that, you know,
having the houses closer together would be unsafe for the residents of both properties in the future.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: How far is your home from the shared property line?

STEVE ALEXANDER: 15 feet. Our setback is 15 feet. The night of the fire I determined that the houses were 28 feet apart and now they're going to be 25 feet apart.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Just to follow up, Randy suggested they met with you and discussed this. At some level, that's -- could you characterized that discussion for us?

STEVE ALEXANDER: This is my wife, Sylvia.

SYLVIA ALEXANDER: Sylvia Alexander, 215 Inwood Drive. Yeah, this is actually really hard for us because we have a great relationship with the Teegardins and it's not easy. John came over on Valentines night and chatted with me briefly. I was making Valentine steak and I had my 3-year old running around. And he asked if it would be okay, and I said at the time, yeah, you know what, I think it would be fine, And I think Steve would be okay with it as well.

But then after my husband and I had a chance to chat, we started talking about it and it was a very scarey
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night. I know it was very scary for them. And we just
don't want to go through that again. That's just really,
took some time to think about it.

STEVE ALEXANDER: We do have a copy of the
fire investigation report if that would be -- wanted to add
that to the record.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: You can if you wish.
Okay. Do you have anything else?

STEVE ALEXANDER: No.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay, thank you.
Is there anyone in the audience that would
like to speak regarding this application? There being none,
then the Public Hearing is closed.

APPLICATION 3A-10-18

3A-10-18 Application of CoreLife Eatery,
lessee, and Buckingham Properties, owner of property located
at 2600 Elmwood Avenue, for a Sign Variance from
Section 207-26D to allow a business identification sign to be
100% logo where not allowed by code. All as described on
application and plans on file.

CJ HAHNS: Yes, my name is CJ Hahns, I
represent CoreLife, going in at 600 Elmwood Avenue. What we
are asking for is the ability to add a logo to the building
frontage. Based off of our evaluation and looking at the property, we are taking up the complete building at 2600 Elmwood. We are surrounded by multi-tenant buildings and our concern is making sure that patrons understand that we are a part of the whole building, CoreLife is the whole building.

Based off of the architect and what we feel is appropriate, our goal is to try to make the architecture and the sign work together. Therefore, our hope is that by putting the logo on the right side of the building is the most attractive way to accomplish, one, catching people as they coming in from the other tenants and the cut-through street from Monroe Avenue over to Elmwood.

In addition, quite frankly, not over-signing the building, trying to keep it aesthetically pleasing and matching the architecture.

MS. SCHWARTZ: This is, Rick, this is the second building face sign though, right?

MR. DiSTEFANO: Yes, which they are permitted.

MS. SCHWARTZ: They can have two?

MR. DiSTEFANO: They can have ten, as long as they don't go over their allotted number of square footage.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Why do we have some businesses
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coming in then for a variance for a building face sign?

MR. DiSTEFANO: Because they're on two
different sides, maybe. This is all on the same side, it's
all on the one face.

MS. SCHWARTZ: All the more reason they only
need one. I mean, there's one entryway when you come in,
there's only going to be one doorway to get into the place,
right?

CJ HAHNS: Correct, yes, ma'am.

MS. SCHWARTZ: So once you walk in you're
going to know this is the whole place.

CJ HAHNS: Sure. The concern is getting them
to the door. Our goal is to make sure we identify that we
have the whole building to the person that's either at the
other --

MS. SCHWARTZ: Are you changing the entryway
in any way from what it is today? Are you taking the steps
out or changing the door? Because right now it is very
prominent, you know, that's the only way to get into the
building.

CJ HAHNS: Yes, it's a new design of the
building.

MS. SCHWARTZ: In other words, you're changing
the entryway dramatically from what it's been all these years?

CJ HAHNS: Yes, ma'am.

MS. DALE: So if it was not 100 percent logo, you just said CoreLife a second time, that would be allowed, Rick?

MR. DiSTEFANO: Yes.

MS. DALE: So Judy, the only thing we have here is not two signs or one, it's a logo versus saying CoreLife --

MS. SCHWARTZ: I think CoreLife is big enough that you're going to see it from wherever you're coming in.

MS. DALE: You can have two.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. We can discuss it in our deliberations.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Okay. Thank you for the information.

CJ HAHNS: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: So are there more questions about the sign?

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Do you use the logo on its own or prominently display it at other locations?

CJ HAHNS: We do this at several locations
across the country. Many times, again, when you go into a space the size that we go into, you want to identify the main entrance. And then you also, we use this as the logo and we often times split it off to the side.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Okay. We've been to the Henrietta one, I just can't remember.

CJ HAHNS: Right, no, it's different.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: It's a narrower storefront.

CJ HAHNS: Exactly.

MS. CORRADO:

MS. WATSON: Does this need to and/or has this already gone through ARB?

MR. DiSTEFANO: Yes, and I believe, yes.

MS. WATSON: Anything to comment on about the Architectural Review Board process?

CJ HAHNS: No, ma'am, not that I'm aware of.

MR. DiSTEFANO: No, basically their condition was to get your variances.

MS. CORRADO: And at this time you intend only to have signage on the east facing side of the building, nothing on the Elmwood Avenue side.

CJ HAHNS: Correct, yes, ma'am.
MS. WATSON: Is that a cauliflower logo?

CJ HAHNS: Yes, ma'am.

MS. WATSON: It's set back far enough from the street, I'm wondering if you can comment on the visibility of the logo of the sign from either Elmwood or Monroe?

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Is that -- or maybe the follow up is that what you're trying to do or are you trying to somehow gain people who are already into the parking lot that realize your business is there? Which are you trying to do, or both?

CJ HAHNS: Probably both, being quite frank. You know, one, you have the cut through street that cuts through. You want to make sure that you catch people. And I understand that you'd probably see it with the CoreLife on the left side. The people that are in the -- because this is a big parking lot area. In addition to that, we just want to make sure that we also identify, hey, this isn't a whole bunch of different restaurants, or this isn't empty space. This is part of CoreLife.

MS. WATSON: I'm just trying to tease on whether it would be fair of me to say that the primary use of this is for people who are already in the plaza.

CJ HAHNS: Yes, ma'am.
CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: You know how many feet it is back from the CoreLife building?

CJ HAHNS: We're approximately about 62 feet away from the CoreLife sign itself.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay.

MR. DiSTEFANO: I guess the other point too, if you took this and you stuck it right next to CoreLife, there wouldn't be a variance necessary. The other thing too, is if you drew a box around the whole thing so you didn't need a logo variance, then they'd have too much signage on the building even though it would be all blank wall. So you can't call it one sign.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Plus, didn't you tell us this logo is not presented next to the main sign as many businesses do? It is not depicted that way in generality, the logo?

CJ HAHNS: Oftentimes not no, sir. Oftentimes we have the logo and then we'll have a blade sign that depicts the bowl or we'll have the logo off to a separate area.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. I think I understand that. Any other questions? Thank you.

CJ HAHNS: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak regarding this application? There being none, then the Public Hearing is closed.

APPLICATION 3A-11-18

3A-11-18 Application of Josh Schmieder, contractor, and Lisa Curwin, owner of property located at One Pelham Road, for an Area Variance from Section 203-2.1B(2) to allow a shed/gazebo structure to be 510 square feet in size in lieu of the maximum 250 square feet allowed by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

JOSH SCHMIEDER: Good evening, my name is Josh Schmieder as you mentioned earlier. I appreciate you taking the time. I know you guys have plans in front of you. Basically what's happening is my customer we're doing all of the designs for, wanted to create a pool house/storage area, as well as a covered patio area.

They have elderly parents and other in their family that it gets very hot with the sun in back of the house on the existing pool area. We're actually recreating and doing some new patio area and recreating their backyard space that they currently have. They did want to cover a part of that patio with a nice post and beam style, a covered
patio. They also wanted a spot to store their pool equipment, toys, things like that, to have a clean space to use those.

They had thought about building two separate structures, which is possible because of the square foot requirement of 250 square feet I believe, that is. But when we designed that up it just looked very messy in their backyard and didn't keep with the upscale look of the neighborhood. So they thought that creating a pool house and covered patio combination actually looked much more classy and then just really fit the style of the neighborhood.

So we are presenting instead of two separate structures, a tacky looking shed, 10x12 or something in the corner, spending the extra money to kind of make it look like an actual exterior structure or pool house, per se.

We did check with the neighbors and since we filed the application and the neighbor next to them did write a letter saying they're perfectly fine with this as well. So I do have some copies here if you would like to add that to your file. And so, the neighbors really don't have any concerns unless there's somebody here I'm not aware of. But the ones that would be directly affected by this don't have any concerns and wrote that letter. So, any questions?
MS. SCHWARTZ: You said the letter's from the neighbors?

JOSH SCHMIEDER: The one directly next to it.

MS. SCHWARTZ: What about the one behind?

Because you can see it too.

JOSH SCHMIEDER: Let me look at which one this is. This is from Jeffrey Goldstein, if you want to pass it around.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Is it just one letter?

JOSH SCHMIEDER: I just have the one neighbor, just the one letter. So the one neighbor really isn't affected, I think it's the one to the left, because the house and all of the heavy screening is, they really won't even see it. So the one, this is actually a mistake, and this is the one behind which has the actual, yard's actually touch. This is Mr. Goldstein, which is -- correct, and so they did approach him.

The one to the side, it's heavily screened, so I stand corrected, that is Mr. Goldstein behind, and he was perfectly fine with that. I believe you have 3-D renderings as well to get a concept of the style.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: One concern would be that, again, we appreciate what they're trying to do, so you don't
think there's any possibility that a further enclosure of this structure will be something they would be considering?

JOSH SCHMIEDER: They really can't unless they just want to throw out tens of thousands of dollars, because they are going to have a double-sided fireplace that they would have to somehow remove and, you know, and do completely different, which is a feature that's tens of thousands of dollars. So without them wasting a lot of money, as well as their outdoor kitchen, they're going to have a grill and what not, off to the side. They would have to remove that because now it's going to be enclosed and grilling in an enclosed area is not wise. I don't see how throwing away tens of thousands of dollars that they would ever enclose the rest of the structure. Which if they did, I guess they would have to come to you.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Well, it depends on how we condition it in writing. Other questions?

MR. DiSTEFANO: For the record, the height of the structure?

JOSH SCHMIEDER: I had that, it was below the height requirement in the code, it was two and a half feet lower than what was in the code.

MR. DiSTEFANO: So approximately 14 feet in
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height?

JOSH SCHMIEDER: Yes, about 14, 14 and a half feet in height.


JOSH SCHMIEDER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak regarding this application? There being none, then the Public Hearing is closed.

APPLICATION 3A-12-18

3A-12-18 Application of Jack Sigrist, architect, and Tom Huber, owner of property located at 2 Parsons Lane, for an Area Variance from Section 209-10 to allow livable floor area to increase from 4,129 square feet to 4,154 square feet where a maximum 3,291 square feet is allowed by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: I presume you are well rested then?

JACK SIGRIST: Yes, I am. I'm Jack Sigrist, the architect for the project, Tom and Cathy Huber own property at 2 Parsons Lane. They are hoping to enclose a roofed-over porch that exceeds the size of the house for the
property by 25 square feet. You can see the outline of the property, the porch is right there. The intent is to get a larger mudroom because the mudroom right now is probably 5x6. And it has the entrance from the kitchen and the entrance to another room and an entrance from the outside that are all cramped in there. They're trying to expand and get some space. Did anybody get this?

MR. DiSTEFANO: Did you submit it with the application?

JACK SIGRIST: It's the only one I've got.

MR. DiSTEFANO: So you're just showing us what --

JACK SIGRIST: Where it is, what the --

MR. DiSTEFANO: Why don't you just show them and just kind of point it out them. You can kind of tell off the plans, but it does get a little confusing. So, Jack, in essence, it is a roofed-over area already, it's just enclosing of a roofed-over area that already exists, of 25 square feet.

JACK SIGRIST: Correct. I think it's 3.5x6.

MS. CORRADO: I know it's a little hard to see on the plans, and also a little hard to see when one stops by the house. Is the work completed already?
JACK SIGRIST: No. They got the ARB gave us their approval, we started some material renovations that we have a building permit for, we're waiting on the porch to see if we get approval of that.

MS. CORRADO: Okay.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: And this is an area of Brighton that many other properties exceed the livable allowable square footage?

JACK SIGRIST: Yes. Right across the street is a similar situation, 8 Parsons.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Any questions? Very good, thank you.

Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak regarding this application? There being none, then the Public Hearing is closed.

Let's take a five-minute or so break.
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REPORTER CERTIFICATE

I, Rhoda Collins, do hereby certify that I did report in stenotype machine shorthand the proceedings held in the above-entitled matter;

Further, that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate transcription of my said stenographic notes taken at the time and place hereinbefore set forth.

Dated this 3rd day of April, 2018.
At Rochester, New York

Rhoda Collins
PROCEEDINGS HELD BEFORE THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS AT
2300 ELMWOOD AVENUE, ROCHESTER, NEW YORK ON MARCH 7TH, 2018
AT APPROXIMATELY 9:40 P.M.

March 7th, 2018
Brighton Town Hall
2300 Elmwood Avenue
Rochester, New York 14618

PRESENT:
DENNIS MIETZ, CHAIRPERSON
CHRISTINE CORRADO
JEANNE DALE
JUDY SCHWARTZ
ANDREA TOMPKINS WRIGHT
JENNIFER WATSON

NOT PRESENT:
DOUGLAS CLAPP

DAVID DOLLINGER, ESQ.
Town Attorney

RICK DiSTEFANO
Secretary

(The Board having considered the information presented by the
Applicant in each of the following cases and having completed
the required review pursuant to SEQRA, the following
decisions were made:)
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APPLICATION 3A-01-18

3A-01-18 Application of 1950 Brighton Henrietta Town Road, LP, owner of property located at 1950 Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road, for an Area Variance from Section 205-8 to allow impervious lot coverage, after site improvements, to be 74.5% of the lot area in lieu of the maximum 65% allowed by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

Motion made by Ms. Schwartz to approve Application 3A-01-18 based on the following findings and facts.

FINDINGS AND FACTS:

1. The requested variance to increase the impervious lot coverage is 09.5 percent over what is allowed by code on a lot of ten and a half acres in a light industrial zone.

2. The requested variance will allow for the construction of a paved access road resulting in a more simplified circulation of the equipment.

3. The storage yard has been expanded as need in the past without updated approvals. This plan would limit the storage yard as well, installing a fence and bringing the yard closer to compliance.

4. There will be no detrimental change in the character of
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the area and it may even be improved with the screening, the paved access road, and a reduction of the storage area.

5. There will be no change to the landscape area in front of the structure on Town Line Road.

CONDITIONS:

1. This variance only applies to the requested lot coverage of 74.5 percent to create an access road at 1950 Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road. In particular, all required storm water improve mitigation improvements shall be implemented.

2. All Planning Board approvals shall be obtained.

(Second by Ms. Tompkins Wright.)

(Ms. Corrado, yes; Ms. Watson, yes; Mr. Mietz, yes; Ms. Dale, yes; Ms. Tomkins Wright, yes; Ms. Schwartz, yes.)

(Upon roll call, motion to approve with conditions carries.)
APPLICATION 3A-02-18

3A-02-18 Application of 1950 Brighton Henrietta Town Road, LP, owner of property located at 330 Metro Park, for an Area Variance from Section 205-eight to allow impervious lot coverage, after site improvements, to increase from 73.5% of lot area to 79% in lieu of the maximum 65% impervious lot coverage allowed by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

Motion made by Ms. Tompkins Wright to approve Application 3A-02-18 based on the following findings and facts.

**FINDINGS AND FACTS:**

1. The granting of the requested variance will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or be a detriment to the nearby properties. The surrounding areas are all industrial in nature and most of the impervious coverage will be located to the rear/west of the building enclosed with a screening fence. Further, applicant testified that it will install a storm water management system to mitigate excess runoff to the additional impervious coverage.

2. The requested variance is not substantial as it represents only a 5.5 percent increase over the current
impervious coverage on site.

3. The benefit sought by the applicant cannot reasonably be achieved by any other method. The property already exceeds the impervious coverage maximum, and due to size and parking constraints any improvements to connect the property with its neighboring properties would likely necessitate a variance.

4. There's no evidence that the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. The variance granted herein applies only to improvements described in and in the location as depicted on the application and in the testimony given. All required storm water management systems shall be implemented.

2. All necessary Planning Board approvals and permits must be obtained.

   (Second by Ms. Schwartz.)

   (Ms. Dale, yes; Mr. Mietz, yes; Ms. Watson, yes; Ms. Corrado, yes; Ms. Schwartz, yes; Ms. Tomkins Wright, yes.)

   (Upon roll call, motion to approve with conditions carries.)
APPLICATION 3A-04-18

3A-04-18 Application of The Baptist Temple, owner of property located at 1101 Clover Street, for a Temporary and Revocable Use Permit pursuant to Section 219-4 to allow for a two-day (April 28th & 29, 2018) outdoor educational event in a RLA Single Family District. All as described on application and plans on file.

Motion made by Ms. Corrado to deny Application 3A-04-18 based on the following findings and facts.

FINDINGS AND FACTS:

1. Under applicable zoning, it's not a proper use of the property given that the church is located in a substantially residential area and bounded by two busy roads. The event as a whole is not suitable for such a neighborhood. In particular, due to simulated gunfire, open fire pits, and overnight camping on the church campus.

(Second by Ms. Schwartz.)
(Ms. Tompkins Wright, yes; Ms. Dale, yes; Mr. Mietz, yes; Ms. Watson, yes; Ms. Schwartz, yes; Ms. Corrado, yes.)

(Upon roll call, motion to deny carries.)
APPLICATION 3A-05-18

3A-05-18 Application of Home Power Systems, contractor, and Stephen Sanko, owner of property located at 88 Golfside Parkway for an Area Variance from Section 203-2.1B(6) to allow a standby emergency generator to be located in a side yard in lieu of the rear yard behind the house as required by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

Motion made by Ms. Corrado to approve Application 3A-05-18 based on the following findings and facts.

**FINDINGS AND FACTS:**

One. The requested variance is not substantial as the home's gas meter is located at the front of the home and the electric meter is located at the rear, making the side yard midway between the two, the optimal location.

2. No other alternative can alleviate the difficulty and produce the desired result that of avoiding extensive underground utility work and avoiding intrusion on the existing back patio.

3. No unacceptable change in the character of the neighborhood and no substantial detriment to nearby properties is expected to result in the approval of this
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variance as the generator is to be used only in place of power interruption, not as a primary source of power. Further, the generator will be screened by existing vegetation to minimize the negative aesthetic impact.

4. The alleged hardship is self-created by the applicant only in that the standby generator is not a part of the original construction of the home, thereby making citing it and according to code awkward.

5. The health, safety, and welfare of the community will not be adversely affected.

CONDITIONS:

1. This variance will only apply to the generator as described in the application and testimony. It will not apply to additional generators considered in the future.

2. All necessary Town approvals and permits shall be obtained.

   (Second by Ms. Tompkins Wright.)

   (Ms. Schwartz, yes; Ms. Dale, yes; Ms. Watson, yes; Mr. Mietz, yes; Ms. Tompkins Wright, yes; Ms. Corrado, yes.)

   (Upon roll call, motion to approve with conditions carries.)
APPLICATION 3A-06-18

3A-06-18 Application of Faith Bible Church, owner of property located at 1095 East Henrietta Road for an Area Variance from Section 205-8 to allow a church building addition to be constructed 17.5 ft. from a side (north) lot line in lieu of the minimum 50 ft. required by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

Motion made by Ms. Dale to approve Application 3A-06-18 based on the following findings and facts.

FINDINGS AND FACTS:

1. The church purchased an existing building on a lot with a width of only 200 feet. The church desires to improve their facility and the services that they provide to their congregation by adding 7,670 square foot addition to the building to add space for children's programs, recreation space, and an indoor area for youth group events.

2. The applicant has testified the need for the new space to be indoors for protection from inclement weather and for nighttime activities.

3. There was an existing garage, which is 13 feet from the same northern property line as the variance request for the building addition.

4. The applicant has testified that the location and layout
of the building addition was designed to minimize disturbance and best integrate with the existing building.

5. The proposed variance will not result in a substantial change to the character of the neighborhood or be a detriment to nearby properties as the subject property is in a primarily industrial neighborhood. Also, there's an existing 6-foot stockade wood fence on the property line which provides screening for the property.

6. The proposed variance is consistent with surrounding properties and it will not have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the neighborhood.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. The existing Dumpster will be repositioned and an enclosure will be added.

2. The existing 6-foot high stockade wood fence will remain in place and shall be maintained.

3. This application's approval is subject to Architectural Review Board and Planning Board approvals.

4. It applies only to the addition as per plans submitted and testimony given.

   (Second by Ms. Schwartz.)

   (Ms. Corrado, yes; Ms. Watson, yes; Mr. Mietz, yes; Ms. Tompkins Wright; Ms. Schwartz, yes; Ms. Dale, yes.)
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(Upon roll call, motion to approve with conditions carries.)
APPLICATION 3A-07-18

3A-07-18 Application of Brighton 12 Corners Associates, LLC, owner of property located at 1881 Monroe Avenue, for an Area Variance from Section 205-12 to allow for 88 on-site parking spaces to accommodate existing uses and the establishment of a 3,190-square foot urgent care facility where 129 parking spaces are required by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

Motion made by Ms. Dale to approve Application 3A-07-18 based on the following findings and facts.

**FINDINGS AND FACTS:**

1. Although the variance is substantial, the applicant has submitted a traffic study that shows that there is adequate parking for all uses currently in existence on the site throughout the day.

2. There will be no unacceptable change in the character of the neighborhood and no substantial detriment to nearby properties is expected to result from the approval of this variance since ample parking appears to exist. The health, safety, and welfare of the community will not be adversely affected by the approval of this variance request and may actually benefit the health, welfare and safety of the community by providing the valuable service to the community.
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CONDITIONS:
1. The size of the facility shall be limited to the 3,200 square feet.
2. The hours of operation will be 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.
3. The maximum number of clinicians at any given time shall not exceed two.
4. The granting of this variance is based upon the application as submitted and testimony given.
5. All necessary building permits shall be obtained.
   (Second by Ms. Watson.)
   (Ms. Tompkins Wright, no; Ms. Schwartz, yes; Ms. Corrado, yes; Mr. Mietz, no; Ms. Watson, yes; Ms. Dale, yes.)
   (Upon roll call, motion to approve with conditions carries.)
APPLICATION 3A-09-18

3A-09-18 Application of John and Judy Teegardin, owner of property located at 201 Inwood Drive, for an Area Variance from Section 205-2 to allow for a fire damaged attached garage to be reconstructed with a 9.5 ft. side setback in lieu of the existing 13.1 ft. side setback where a 15 ft. side setback is required by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

Motion made by Ms. Tompkins Wright to approve Application 3A-09-18 based on the following findings and facts.

FINDINGS AND FACTS:

1. The granting of the requested variance will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or be a detriment to nearby properties. The garage is being constructed only 3.5 feet closer than the previously existing garage and such increase will likely not be noticeable to most neighbors. Further, it appears that several other homes and attached garages in the neighborhood are closer to the property line than the zoning code will currently permit under new construction. Lastly, applicant has designed a garage to be significantly safer from a fire safety perspective than the prior existing garage.
2. The requested variance is not substantial as the structure previously extended into the setback and the increase extension into the setback is only an additional 3.5 feet.

3. The benefits sought by the applicant cannot reasonably be achieved by any other method. Modern vehicles and family storage needs often necessitate a wider garage and due to the width of the side lot, there's not enough side yard to construct a compliant garage that meets this applicant's specific needs.

4. There's no evidence that the proposed variance would have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the neighborhood or destruct.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. The variance granted herein applies only to the garage addition describe in the location as depicted on the application and in the testimony given.

2. All necessary Architectural Review Board approvals and building permits shall be obtained.

   (Second by Ms. Dale.)

   (Ms. Corrado, yes; Ms. Watson, yes; Mr. Mietz, yes; Ms. Schwartz, no; Ms. Dale, yes; Ms. Tomkins Wright, yes.)
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(Upon roll call, motion to approve with conditions carries.)
APPLICATION 3A-12-18

3A-12-18 Application of Jack Sigrist, architect, and Tom Huber, owner of property located at 2 Parsons Lane, for an Area Variance from Section 209-10 to allow livable floor area to increase from 4,129 square feet to 4,154 square feet where a maximum 3,291 square feet is allowed by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

Motion made by Ms. Corrado to approve Application 3A-12-18 based on the following findings and facts.

FINDINGS AND FACTS:

1. The requested variance is not substantial as the one currently exceeds the allowable square footage by 838 square feet, an additional 25 square feet of enclosed space is not significant particularly as the home is located in the neighborhood of similarly expansive homes.

2. No other alternative can alleviate the difficulty and produce the desired result. By enclosing the service porch and incorporating the space into the existing mudroom the applicant will gain function without detriment to the aesthetic of the home.

3. No unacceptable change in the character of the
neighborhood and no substantial detriment to nearby property is expected to result from the approval of this variance as the exterior enclosure will be consistent with the design and materials of the existing structure.

4. The alleged hardship was not self-created by the applicant as the existing mudroom is simply too small to be effective and the old service porch does not mitigate the ineffectiveness of the small mudroom.

5. The health, safety, and welfare of the community will not be adversely affected.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. This variance will apply only to the structure that was described in the application and testimony. It will not apply to further additions considered in the future that are not included in the present application.

2. All necessary town approvals and building permits shall be obtained.

   (Second by Ms. Watson.)

   (Ms. Schwartz, yes; Ms. Tompkins Wright, yes; Ms. Dale, yes; Mr. Mietz, yes; Ms. Watson, yes; Ms. Corrado, yes.)

   (Upon roll call, motion to approve with conditions carries.)
APPLICATION 3A-03-18

3A-03-18 Application of Art Parts Signs, Inc., contractor, and 2815 Monroe Retail Office, LLC, owner of property located at 2815 Monroe Avenue, for a Sign Variance from Section 207-26D to allow a logo to be 28.75% of the sign area in lieu of the maximum 25% allowed by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

Motion made by Ms. Watson to approve Application 3A-03-18 based on the following findings and facts.

**FINDINGS AND FACTS:**

1. The requested variance is not substantial as the size of the logo is not a significant increase from the allowance and up until now the sign has been in use at a previous location in Brighton.

2. No unacceptable change in the character of the neighborhood and no substantial detriment to nearby properties is expected to result from the approval of this variance because the area is commercial and the sign is in keeping with others in the neighborhood.

3. The health, safety, and welfare of the community will not be adversely effected by the approval of this variance request. The reuse and recycling of this historic sign is
beneficial to the environment and is easily recognizable to customers traveling along the business corridor.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. This variance will apply only to the sign as described in the application and in testimony.

2. All necessary Architectural Review Board and Planning Board approvals shall be obtained.

   (Second by Ms. Corrado.)

   (Ms. Schwartz, no; Ms. Tomkins Wright, yes; Ms. Dale, yes; Mr. Mietz, yes; Ms. Corrado, yes; Ms. Watson, yes.)

   (Upon roll call, motion to approve with conditions carries.)
APPLICATION 3A-08-18.

3A-08-18 Application of Yuri and Anna Joselson, owners of property located at 10 Chalet Circle, for an Area Variance from Section 205-2 to allow a building addition to extend 7 ft. into the 18.75 ft. side setback required by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

Motion made by Ms. Schwartz to approve Application 3A-08-18 based on the following findings and facts.

FINDINGS AND FACTS:

1. The side setback variance to extend 7 feet into the 18.75 foot side setback is sizable but allows for a more square addition rather than a long narrow room extending into the backyard. In order to accommodate the movement of equipment and door widths within the addition a more square space is needed.

2. Granting of the variance will allow a family member to be cared for more easily, especially as she gets older.

3. No other alternative can achieve the desired result of the applicant such as using the existing deck as it is in the middle of the back of the house and also going behind the garage would result in extending the addition further into
the backyard.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. This variance is only for the construction of the addition to extend 7 feet into the 18.75 foot side setback.
2. All necessary building permits shall be obtained.
3. All materials will match the existing house.

   (Second by Ms. Corrado.)

   (Ms. Dale, yes; Mr. Mietz, yes; Ms. Watson, yes; Ms. Tomkins Wright, yes; Ms. Corrado, yes; Ms. Schwartz, yes.)

   (Upon roll call, motion to approve with conditions carries.)
APPLICATION 3A-10-18

3A-10-18 Application of CoreLife Eatery, lessee, and Buckingham Properties, owner of property located at 2600 Elmwood Avenue, for a Sign Variance from Section 207-26D to allow a business identification sign to be 100% logo where not allowed by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

Motion made by Ms. Watson to approve Application 3A-10-18 based on the following findings and facts.

FINDINGS AND FACTS:

1. The requested variance the minimum variance possible because the sign reflects the corporate logo of the restaurant needed for brand consistency.

2. No unacceptable change in the character of the neighborhood and no substantial detriment to nearby property is expected to result from the approval of this variance request.

3. The sign will be visible only from the parking lot and commercial properties which have similar logo oriented signage. The logo sign provides balance with the textual sign and fits the scale of the elevation.

4. The logo sign plus the textual sign combined would not
exceed the 25 percent allowance for the logo and will not exceed the allowable square footage for the total signage.

CONDITIONS:

1. This variance will only apply to the signs described in the application and testimony. In particular, it would not apply to additional signs considered in the future that are not included in the present application.

2. All necessary Architectural Review Board permits and Planning Board approvals shall be obtained.

(Second by Ms. Tompkins Wright.)

(Ms. Corrado, yes; Ms. Schwartz, no; Ms. Dale, yes; Mr. Mietz, yes; Ms. Tomkins Wright, yes; Ms. Watson, yes.)

(Upon roll call, motion to approve with conditions carries.)
APPLICATION 3A-11-18

3A-11-18 Application of Josh Schmieder, contractor, and Lisa Curwin, owner of property located at One Pelham Road, for an Area Variance from Section 203-2.1B(2) to allow a shed/gazebo structure to be 510 square feet in size in lieu of the maximum 250 square feet allowed by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

Motion made by Ms. Corrado to approve Application 3A-11-18 based on the following findings and facts.

FINDINGS AND FACTS:

1. Although more than double the allowable size, the requested variance is mitigated by the thoughtful design of the structure.

2. No other alternative can alleviate the difficulty or produce the desired result by combining the shed storage function and gazebo function into a single structure. Both the functional and the recreational needs will be met with less negative aesthetic impact that two separate structures sized to code would create.

3. No unacceptable change in the character of the neighborhood and no substantial detriment to nearby properties is expected to result from the approval of this
variance as the view of this structure from neighboring properties is screened by vegetation.

4. The alleged hardship was not self-created by the applicant as the pool was already in place at the time of the purchase of the home. Further, the existing deck is failing and in need of replacement. This combined shed and gazebo is an appropriate solution.

5. The health, safety, and welfare of the community will not be adversely effected by the approval of this variance request.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. This variance will apply only to the structure that was described in the application and testimony. In particular, the 366-square foot covered patio shall not be enclosed in the future.

2. All necessary building permits shall be obtained.

   (Second by Ms. Schwartz.)

   (Ms. Tompkins Wright, yes; Ms. Dale, yes; Mr. Mietz, yes; Ms. Watson, yes; Ms. Schwartz, yes; Ms. Corrado, yes.)

   (Upon roll call, motion to approve with conditions carries.)

*   *   *   *
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