# AGENDA <br> TOWN OF PITTSFORD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS <br> JULY 17, 2023 

This agenda is subject to change.
Please take notice that the Town of Pittsford Zoning Board of Appeals will hold the following meeting on Monday, July 17, 2023, in the Lower-Level Meeting Room of Pittsford Town Hall, 11 S. Main Street, and beginning at 7:00PM local time.

## NEW HEARINGS

## 43 Musket Lane

Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Sections 185-113 B. (1) and 185-17 I. for the construction of an oversized shed within the rear buffer. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

## 14 Wood Stone Rise

Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185-113 B. (1) for the construction of a roofed accessory structure exceeding 180 square feet in area (pavilion). Property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

## 143 S Main Street

Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Sections 185-113 B. (3) and 185-17 E. for the construction of an inground pool forward of the rear wall of the house and not meeting the total side setback requirement. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

## 16 Winding Road

Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185-17 B. for the construction of a garage addition extending forward of the building line. The property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

## 6 Rosewood Drive

Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Sections $185-17$ B. and $185-17$ D. for the construction of an addition extending forward of the building line and an unenclosed porch past the allowed façade area. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

## 28 Whitestone Lane

Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185-17 B. for the construction of a three-car garage addition extending forward of the building line on Malm Lane. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

## 60 Golf Avenue (HWY)

Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems dba Verizon Wireless is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185126 C. (3)(b)[2] for the construction of a 125 -foot cellular facility (monopole) where the maximum height permitted is 100 feet. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

## OTHER BUSINESS

## Approval of Minutes

# TOWN OF PITTSFORD <br> LEGAL NOTICE <br> ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING 

JULY 17, 2023
Please take notice that the following public hearings will be held by the Town of Pittsford Zoning Board of Appeals on Monday, July 17, 2023, in the Lower-Level Meeting Room of Pittsford Town Hall, 11 S . Main St, and beginning at 7:00PM local time:

Public Hearings:
43 Musket Lane, Tax ID 192.08-1-26 - Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Sections 185-113 B. (1) and 185-17 I. for the construction of an oversized shed within the rear buffer. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

14 Wood Stone Rise, Tax ID 178.19-3-16 - Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185113 B. (1) for the construction of a roofed accessory structure exceeding 180 square feet in area (pavilion). Property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

143 S Main Street, Tax ID 164.10-4-12 - Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Sections 185113 B. (3) and 185-17 E. for the construction of an inground pool forward of the rear wall of the house and not meeting the total side setback requirement. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

16 Winding Road, Tax ID 151.14-1-12 - Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185-17 B. for the construction of a garage addition extending forward of the building line. The property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

6 Rosewood Drive, Tax ID 178.16-2-61 - Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Sections 18517 B . and 185-17 D. for the construction of an addition extending forward of the building line and an unenclosed porch forward of the allowed façade area. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

28 Whitestone Lane, Tax ID 137.20-2-35 - Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Section 18517 B . for the construction of a three-car garage addition extending forward of the building line on Malm Lane. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

60 Golf Avenue (HWY), Tax ID 151.15-2-34 - Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems dba Verizon Wireless is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185-126 C. (3)(b)[2] for the construction of a 125-foot cellular facility (monopole) where the maximum height permitted is 100 feet. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

April Zurowski
Planning Assistant

# TOWN OF PITTSFORD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MAY 15, 2023 

Minutes of the Town of Pittsford Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on May 15, 2023, at 7:00PM local time. The meeting took place in the Lower-Level Meeting Room of Pittsford Town Hall, 11 S. Main Street.

PRESENT: George Dounce, Barbara Servé, Phil Castleberry, Mary Ellen Spennacchio-Wagner, Jennifer lacobucci, Tom Kidera, Jim Pergolizzi

ABSENT: None
ALSO PRESENT: April Zurowski, Planning Assistant; Doug DeRue, Director of Planning, Zoning, \& Development; Robert Koegel, Town Attorney; Bill Zink, Building Inspector; Kate Munzinger, Town Board Liaison

ATTENDANCE: There were 11 members of the public present.
Zoning Board of Appeals Chairman George Dounce called the meeting to order at 7:00PM.

## NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS:

## 2 Charter Oaks Drive

Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185-17 B. for a proposed garage expansion encroaching into the front setback. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

Scott Harder, of Professional Engineering Group, introduced the application. The applicant is seeking an 8.7 -foot area variance for a garage expansion into the front setback. This property is a corner lot with two front setbacks. This garage expansion will avoid the need for a shed in the rear yard. The existing home is a single-story ranch approximately 18 feet in height. The expansion will match the existing home's elevation.

Vice Chairwoman Barb Servé asked if the Town has received any comments from neighbors. Mr. Zink stated that no comments were received. Chairman George Dounce asked the applicant for their expected construction timeline. Mr. Parcher stated that this application will also require approval from the Design Review and Historic Preservation Board (DRHPB). Once this approval is granted, the applicant expects to begin construction this summer. All work will be completed prior to December 31, 2024.

Chairman Dounce opened the public hearing. No public comments were offered.
Zoning Board of Appeals Member Phil Castleberry motioned to close the public hearing, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Tom Kidera. Following a unanimous voice vote, the hearing was closed.

A written resolution to grant the area variance for 2 Charter Oaks Drive was moved by Zoning Board of Appeals Vice Chairwoman Barb Servé, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Mary Ellen Spennachio-Wagner.

The resolution is contingent upon the following Conditions of Approval:

1. This variance is granted only for the plans submitted and prepared by the Applicant dated March 28, 2023.
2. All construction is to be completed by December 31, 2024.

Chairman Dounce asked for a roll call vote.

| Barbara Servé | Aye |
| :--- | :---: |
| Jim Pergolizzi | Aye |
| Mary Ellen Spennacchio-Wagner | Aye |
| Phil Castleberry | Aye |
| Tom Kidera | Aye |
| Jennifer lacobucci | Aye |
| George Dounce | Aye |

## 7 Grey Fawn

Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185-17 H. for greater than $40 \%$ lot coverage. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

Bob Hyman, of 7 Grey Fawn, introduced the application. The applicant is requesting an impervious coverage variance for the construction of a sunroom addition. The applicant stated that the property's impervious coverage has been over the allowed $40 \%$ since he moved in. The sunroom addition will add 120 square feet of coverage. The applicant plans to mitigate the increased coverage by removing sections of a brick walkway. In total, the property will result in 252 square feet over the allowed 8,274 square feet, $41.07 \%$ of impervious coverage where $40 \%$ is allowed by code. The applicant received Design Review Board approval for the sunroom addition in February 2023, at which time the impervious coverage issues were first discovered. Since this time, the applicant has been working closely with Rob Fromberger, the Town Engineer. Mr. Fromberger has submitted a letter to the Board regarding this variance request.

Board Member Spennachio-Wagner stated that the brick pathway will be relocated to reduce impervious coverage and prevent small children from playing near the sunroom which creates safety concerns. Board Member Jennifer lacobucci asked if the property was already over 40\% impervious coverage. Board Member Spennachio-Wagner confirmed. Vice Chairwoman Servé asked if there are current drainage issues at the property. Mr. Hyman stated that there are no ongoing drainage concerns. Neighbors were also surveyed regarding drainage issues. Board Member Jim Pergolizzi asked if the final impervious coverage percentage includes the relocation and reduction of the brick pathway. Mr. DeRue confirmed.

Chairman Dounce opened the public hearing. No public comments were offered.
Zoning Board of Appeals Member Jennifer lacobucci motioned to close the public hearing, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Vice Chairwoman Barb Servé. Following a unanimous voice vote, the hearing was closed.

A written resolution to grant the area variance for 7 Grey Fawn was moved by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Mary Ellen Spennachio-Wagner, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Tom Kidera.

The resolution is contingent upon the following Conditions of Approval:

1. This variance is granted only for the plans modified and prepared by the Applicant presented at the Zoning Board meeting dated May 15, 2023.
2. All construction is to be completed by December 31, 2024.

Chairman Dounce asked for a roll call vote.

| Barbara Servé | Aye |
| :--- | :---: |
| Jim Pergolizzi | Aye |
| Mary Ellen Spennacchio-Wagner | Aye |
| Phil Castleberry | Aye |
| Tom Kidera | Aye |
| Jennifer lacobucci | Aye |
| George Dounce | Aye |

## 10 Poinciana Drive (PVT)

Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185-113 B. (1)(2)(3) \& (6) amd 185-17 E. to locate an oversized and over-height accessory structure (detached garage) located forward of the rear wall of the home encroaching on the side setback of the property. The garage is proposed to be 20 feet from the side property line, 22 feet high, and 1,543 square feet in area. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

Koen Goorman, of 10 Poinciana Drive, introduced his application. The applicant was granted this variance in 2020, but the variance has now expired. The scope of work and variance request has not changed since the previous approval.

Chairman Dounce opened the public hearing. No public comments were offered.
Zoning Board of Appeals Member Jim Pergolizzi motioned to close the public hearing, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Mary Ellen Spennachio-Wagner. Following a unanimous voice vote, the hearing was closed.

A written resolution to grant the area variance for 10 Poinciana Drive was moved by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Jim Pergolizzi, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Phil Castleberry.

The resolution is contingent upon the following Conditions of Approval:

1. This variance is granted only for the plans submitted and prepared by the Applicant dated August 12, 2020.
2. All construction is to be completed by December 31, 2025.

Chairman Dounce asked for a roll call vote.

| Barbara Servé | Aye |
| :--- | :---: |
| Jim Pergolizzi | Aye |
| Mary Ellen Spennacchio-Wagner | Aye |
| Phil Castleberry | Aye |
| Tom Kidera | Aye |
| Jennifer lacobucci | Aye |
| George Dounce | Aye |

## 9 Knickerbocker Road

Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185-113 B. and 185-120 A. to place a sports court forward of the rear wall of the home and less than the minimum setbacks from Mendon Road and Knickerbocker Road. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

Rich Williams, of 404 Kreag Rd and as agent for Erica Jacobs, owner of 9 Knickerbocker Road, introduced the application. This application is for a residential sports court, forward of the rear wall and less than the minimum front setbacks for the property. This property is a corner lot with two 70 -foot setbacks. The proposed sports court will be screened by existing vegetation along both road frontages. An existing pool takes up a majority of the backyard, so the court is being proposed for the side yard area. The applicant has submitted two options for positioning of the court. The Board revised their resolution to include the option for either choice. Board Member Servé asked if the court would be illuminated. Mr. Williams stated that there is no lighting proposed. Chairman Dounce asked if arbor vitae will be planted to increase buffering. Mr. Williams confirmed. Board Member Pergolizzi asked if neighbors were contacted. Mr. Williams confirmed that neighbors were contacted, and none were opposed.

Chairman Dounce opened the public hearing. No public comments were offered.
Zoning Board of Appeals Member Mary Ellen Spennachio-Wagner motioned to close the public hearing, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Tom Kidera. Following a unanimous voice vote, the hearing was closed.

A written resolution to grant the area variance for 9 Knickerbocker Road was moved by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Jennifer lacobucci, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Mary Ellen Spennachio-Wagner.

The resolution is contingent upon the following Conditions of Approval:

1. This variance is granted only one of either of the two options of plans submitted and prepared by the Applicant dated April 13, 2023.
2. All construction of the court must be completed by December 31, 2024.

Chairman Dounce asked for a roll call vote.

Barbara Servé
Jim Pergolizzi
Mary Ellen Spennacchio-Wagner
Phil Castleberry
Tom Kidera
Jennifer lacobucci
George Dounce

Aye
Aye
Aye
Aye
Aye
Aye
Aye

## 16 Cedarwood Circle

Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185-17 L. for a garage/den addition encroaching into the side setback. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

Lynn Timineri, of 16 Cedarwood Circle, introduced her application. The proposed garage and den addition is positioned to allow the home to become handicap accessible. Jake Smith, agent
for Ms. Timineri, stated that the driveway will be completely redone and will be realigned to meet the garage addition.

Board Member lacobucci stated her concern that neighbors may have trouble accessing the cul-de-sac during construction. Mr. Smith stated that he will consider this during construction. Mary Ellen Spennachio-Wagner asked if this property will be encroaching its impervious coverage limit. Mr. Zink stated that the property is not at or over impervious coverage maximum.
Chairman Dounce asked for the applicant's timeline for construction. Mr. Smith stated that he expects to begin the project this summer.

Chairman Dounce opened the public hearing. No public comments were offered.
Zoning Board of Appeals Member Jennifer lacobucci motioned to close the public hearing, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Phil Castleberry. Following a unanimous voice vote, the hearing was closed.

A written resolution to grant the area variance for 16 Cedarwood Circle was moved by Zoning Board of Appeals Chairman George Dounce, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Jennifer lacobucci.

The resolution passed requiring the following Conditions of Approval:

1. This variance is granted only for the plans submitted and prepared by the Applicant dated April 14, 2023.
2. All construction of the exterior walls of the building must be completed by December 31, 2024.

Chairman Dounce asked for a roll call vote.

| Barbara Servé | Aye |
| :--- | :---: |
| Jim Pergolizzi | Aye |
| Mary Ellen Spennacchio-Wagner | Aye |
| Phil Castleberry | Aye |
| Tom Kidera | Aye |
| Jennifer lacobucci | Aye |
| George Dounce | Aye |

## OTHER DISCUSSION:

The minutes of April 17, 2023 were approved following a motion by Zoning Board of Appeals Chairman George Dounce. Following a unanimous voice vote, the minutes were approved, none opposed.

Verizon Wireless has an open public hearing for an application at 60 Golf Avenue, the Town's Highway Department, for a 125 -foot monopole cellular facility. The Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals will conduct a coordinated SEQRA review for this application. Chairman George Dounce motioned to waive the Zoning Board of Appeals' right to lead agency. Following a unanimous voice vote, the motion was approved.

Mr. Zink reminded the Board that there will be no meeting in June. The next meeting is scheduled for July 17, 2023. Mr. Zink will reach out when the next application deadline has passed.

Zoning Board of Appeals Chairman George Dounce closed the meeting. Following a unanimous voice vote, the meeting concluded at $8: 11 \mathrm{PM}$.

Respectfully submitted,

April Zurowski
Planning Assistant
OFFICIAL MINUTES ARE ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## Zoning Board of Appeals <br> Referral Form Information

## Property Address:

43 Musket Lane PITTSFORD, NY 14534

## Property Owner:

Mulvey, Sean P
43 Musket Ln
Pittsford, NY 14534

## Applicant or Agent:

Mulvey, Sean P
43 Musket Ln
Pittsford, NY 14534

Present Zoning of Property: RN Residential Neighborhood
Area Variance - Residential and Non-Profit

| Town Code Requirement is: |  | Proposed Conditions: |  | Resulting in the Following Variance: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Right Lot Line: |  | Right Lot Line: |  | Right Lot Line: |  |
| Left Lot Line: |  | Left Lot Line: |  | Left Lot Line: |  |
| Front Setback: |  | Front Setback: |  | Front Setback: |  |
| Rear Setback: | 20' | Rear Setback: | $16^{\prime}$ | Rear Setback: | $4.0^{\prime}$ |
| Height: |  | Height: |  | Height: |  |
| Size: | 180 SF | Size: | 288 SF | Size: | 108.0 SF |

Code Section(s): 185-113 B. (1) \& 185-17 I.
Description: Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Sections 185-113 B. (1) and 185-117 I. for the construction of an oversized shed within the rear buffer. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

June 23, 2023
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## RN Residential Neighborhood Zoning



The information depicted on this map is representational and should be used for general reference purposes only. No warranties, expressed or
mplied, are provided for the data or its use or interpretation.
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NOTE: All application information will be available for public view
Applicant:
■ Property Owner
$\square$ Agent

Property Information:
Site Address: 43 MUSKET LANE PITSFORD NY 14534
Property Owner: SEAN MULVEY
Address: 43 MUSKET LANE PITTSFORD NY 14534
Phone: 831-1483
Email: SMULVEY1@ROCHESTER.RR.COM
Tenant:
Address:
Contractor: -NONE
Address:

Phone:
Email:

## Project Information:

Permit Type: $\square$ Residential Bldg. $\square$ Commercial

Emergency Contact for the Project: SEAN MULVEY 831-1483
Occupacy Classification:
Tax ID \#: 192.80-1-26
Estimated Cost of Project: \$9000

## OFFICE USE ONLY

 Building Permit Fees \$ Cert of Occup Fee \$ Recreation Fund Fee \$ Demolition Fee \$Other \$
TOTAL PERMIT FEES \$ $\qquad$

Project Description: PRE BUILT , DELIVERED TO SITE,STORAGE SHED TO ACCOMODATE YARD EQUIPMENT , SET ON GRAVEL BASE APPROX 4 INCH DEEP, SHED IS MOVABLE.

| ENTER DIMENSIONS OF NEW CONSTRUCTION (as per submitted plans) |  | Check off or Fill-in information |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ground Floor Area | Porch | $\square \quad$ Gas logs/insert or wood stove |
| $2{ }^{\text {nd }}$ Floor Area | Deck | $\square \quad$ Generator added to property |
| Lower Level | Pool | Signage |
| Bonus Room | Arbor/Gazebo | Demolition of |
| Garage | Storage/garden shed $12 \times 24 \times 11$ TALL | Other |

## TOTAL SQ. FT. 288

- NOTE: Acceptance does not relieve the agent, applicant, architect, builder, engineer or owner from complying with any of the provisions of the N.Y.S. building codes, energy codes, SEQRA Act, local zoning, etc., whether stated, implied, or omitted in the plans and specifications submitted for the building permit.
- NOTE: By my signature below, I hereby authorize representatives from the Town of Pittsford, Department of Public Works, to enter the above-referenced property, during normal business hours, for the purpose of conducting inspections of the proposed construction activity, as required by applicable law, rules, regulation, ordinances and orders.


$$
05 / 15 / 2023
$$

Signature of Property Owner. or Agent for Property Owner

TOWN OF PITTSFORD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS APPLICATION FOR AREA VARIANCE

Submission Date: $\qquad$ Hearing Date: $\qquad$
Applicant: SEAN MULey
Phone: $\qquad$ $585-831-1453$ E-Mail: SmuLvey16
Agent:


Property Owner: $\qquad$
Address: $\qquad$
Phone: te the Authorization to Make Application Form.)
Property Location: $\qquad$ 43 musket \&ane Current Zoning: $\qquad$
Tax Map Number: $\qquad$ $192,85-1-26$

Application For:
囚
ResidentialCommercialOther

Please describe, in detail, the proposed project:
Desire to set a pre-Built shed, $12 \times 24 \times 11$ feat at rear of propot, 288 sift, on gravel pad

SWORN STATEMENT: As applicant or legal agent for the above described property, I do hereby swear that all statements, descriptions, and signatures appearing on this form and all accompanying materials are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.


$$
5 / 15 / 20023
$$

Owner: Sean Mung 585-831-1483
Address: 43 MUsKET Lane
Please show below:

- Property line dimensions and easements
- Existing buildings
- Existing well/septic (show distance to nearest structure) No
- Road names and location of alleys (if applicable)
- If your property is in a tidal or riverine flood area, indicate elevation of lowest floor of proposed work. N
- The proposed work and the setback distances to the proposed work.
Front Set Back $\frac{120 \text { fort }}{16 \text { feet }}$
Rear Set Back

Left Set Back 74 feet
Right Set Back 11 feet

See A Hacked Instrument survey dated Oct 18,1995 Fully up to Date

James Mo Leon

$$
\text { NY RUS \# } 49225
$$

Lot 51 Mill Pankestates, 2

* 43 musket Lone"


Building Design： $12 \times 24$ De uxe Gambrel Lof Barn

A link to ：his saved design has been sent to smulvey 1＠rcchester rr．com．
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# NEW YORK STATE STANDARDS FOR THE GRANTING OF AREA VARIANCES TOWN LAW SECTION § 267-b-3(b). 

## TESTS FOR GRANTING AREA VARIANCES

In making its determination, the zoning board of appeals shall take into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant. In making such determination, the board shall also consider the following
(Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge)

1. Please explain why you feel the requested variance will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood and why a detriment to nearby properties will not be created by the granting of this area variance:

This pre-built shed confirms to the appearance of 5 similar sheds that my neighbors have behind their properties.
2. Please explain the reasons why the benefit sought by the owner/applicant cannot be achieved by some method other than an area variance:

There is not subsitute for the needed space to accomodate the yard equipment that is currently being stored outdoors. The garage is full with two cars and there is a third car being parked in front of the garage now. so there is not room available in the existing space. Square footage is the solution.
Materials to be stored are Riding Lawn mower, push mower, log splitter, utility trailer, garden equipment, chairs and tables, propane cylinders, water hoses

## TESTS FOR GRANTING AREA VARIANCES (Continued)

3. Please explain whether the requested area variance is minimal or substantial:

This variance will be minimal and will not be visible to casual observers of the neighborhood. It is well behind the 2 story home that is existing.
4. Please explain why you feel the requested area variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental condition in the neighborhood or zoning district:

The pre-built shed will be positioned in the rear or the property and $50 \%$ blocked by the existing garage. It will not be tall enough to change the character of the sight lines of the surrounding homes.

- NOTE: Consideration of the following question shall be relevant to the decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals, but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance;

5. Is the alleged difficulty self-created?

No. As we all know the neighborhood has changed in the past 24 months. Last year there was a pickup truck taken from the Mobil station on Garnsey Rd in Bushnells Basin by a drifter from out of state. Last month 2 cars were stolen from driveways on Brixtion / Surrey Lane area. In Sept 2022 Labor Day weekend one James Boston, 61 of Rochester NY was arrested by sheriff's deputies on Marsh Rd. He was parked on a dirt driveway and was apprehended preparing for burglaries and home invasions. He was carrying an illegal pistol and had an accomplice. Sheriff deputies were not able to find the second person.
As is current New York State law there is no means to hold people for trial due to bali reform. For this reason a homeowners only remedy to avoid theft and loss is to remove any property from sight that could trigger a person to steal it.

## Disclosure Form E

## STATE OF NEW YORK

In the Matter of


The undersigned, being the applicants) to the...
$\square$ Town Board $\square$ Zoning Board of Appeals $\square$ Planning Board $\square$ Architectural Review Board
.... of the Town of Pittsford, for a...

| $\square$ | change of zoning | $\square$ | special permit | $\square$ | building permit |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\square$ permit $\square$ amendment

....issued under the provisions of the Ordinances, Local Laws, Rule or Regulations constituting the zoning and planning ordinances regulations of the Town of Pittsford, do hereby certify that I have read the provisions of Section §809 of the General Municipal Law of the State of New York attached to this certificate.

I do further certify that there is no officer of the State of New York, the County of Monroe or of the Town of Pittsford or of any other municipality of which the Town of Pittsford is a part who is interested in the favorable exercise of discretion by said Board as to this application, except for those named below:


## Zoning Board of Appeals Referral Form Information

## Property Address:

14 Wood Stone PITTSFORD, NY 14534

## Property Owner:

Poe, Heidi M
14 Wood Stone Rise
Pittsford, NY 14534

## Applicant or Agent:

Poe, Heidi M
14 Wood Stone Rise
Pittsford, NY 14534

Present Zoning of Property: RN Residential Neighborhood
Area Variance - Residential and Non-Profit

| Town Code Requirement is: | Proposed Conditions: | Resulting in the Following Variance: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right Lot Line: | Right Lot Line: | Right Lot Line: |
| Left Lot Line: | Left Lot Line: | Left Lot Line: |
| Front Setback: | Front Setback: | Front Setback: |
| Rear Setback: | Rear Setback: | Rear Setback: |
| Height: | Height: | Height: |
| Size: | Size: | 308' |

Code Section(s): 185-113 B. (1)
Description: Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185-113 B. (1) for the construction of a roofed accessory structure exceeding 180 square feet in area (pavilion). Property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

June 23, 2023
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RN Residential Neighborhood Zoning


The information depicted on this map is representational and should be
used for general reference implied, are provided for the data or its use or interpretation.


# TOWN OF PITTSFORD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS APPLICATION FOR AREA VARIANCE 

Submission Date: June 6, 2023 Hearing Date:


Applicant:
Heidi Fredrick
Address:
14 Wood Stone Rise
Phone: $\qquad$ EMail: heidigirl66@yahoo.com

Agent: $\qquad$
Address: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$ E-Mail: $\qquad$
Property Owner: $\qquad$
Address: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$ E-Mail: $\qquad$
(If applicant is not the property owner please complete the Authorization to Make Application Form.)
Property Location: 14 Wood Stone Rise
Current Zoning: L-9
Tax Map Number: $\qquad$
Application For:
(7) Residential
Commercial
$\square$ Other

Please describe, in detail, the proposed project:
Construct outdoor pavilion approximately $19 \mathrm{ft} . \times 12.5 \mathrm{ft}$ ( $22 \mathrm{ft} \times 14 \mathrm{ft}$ including overhangs). Floor finish to be concrete pavers. The ridge will be 10 ft above finished grade.

SWORN STATEMENT: As applicant or legal agent for the above described property, I do hereby swear that all statements, descriptions, and signatures appearing on this form and all accompanying materials are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.



## NEW YORK STATE STANDARDS FOR THE GRANTING OF AREA VARIANCES TOWN LAW SECTION § 267-b-3(b).

## TESTS FOR GRANTING AREA VARIANCES

In making its determination, the zoning board of appeals shall take into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant. In making such determination, the board shall also consider the following:
(Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge)

1. Please explain why you feel the requested variance will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood and why a detriment to nearby properties will not be created by the granting of this area variance:

The proposed structure is only $19 \mathrm{ft} \times 12.5 \mathrm{ft}$. and is onoly 10 ft tall. This structure is not out of scale with the exising house structure or any adjacent propoerties. The will not be any side walls on the structure.
2. Please explain the reasons why the benefit sought by the owner/applicant cannot be achieved by some method other than an area variance:

It is the owners desire to have the structure thin size and scale. If the structure were to be smallerit would not be functional.

## TESTS FOR GRANTING AREA VARIANCES (Continued)

3. Please explain whether the requested area variance is minimal or substantial:

This request is minimal given the size of the proposed structure compared to the house and otther surrounding homes.
4. Please explain why you feel the requested area variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental condition in the neighborhood or zoning district:

The structure and the use of the structure will not creat any significant run off or create any noise or offensive odors. Any lighting proposed would be strictcly low level lighting for safety resons and will not encrouch on the surrounding dark sky

- NOTE: Consideration of the following question shall be relevant to the decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals, but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance;

5. Is the alleged difficulty self-created?

Yes as alomost all variances areself created, but the this standard does not outwiegh the benefits to the owner.




## Zoning Board of Appeals Referral Form Information

## Property Address:

143 South Main Street PITTSFORD, NY 14534

## Property Owner:

Miller, Elizabeth M 143 South Main St
Pittsford, NY 14534

## Applicant or Agent:

Miller, Elizabeth M
143 South Main St
Pittsford, NY 14534

Present Zoning of Property: RN Residential Neighborhood
Area Variance - Residential and Non-Profit

| Town Code Requirement is: | Proposed Conditions: |  | Resulting in the Following Variance: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right Lot Line: | $46.6^{\prime}$ | Right Lot Line: | $44.6^{\prime}$ | Right Lot Line: |
| Left Lot Line: | $43.4^{\prime}$ | Left Lot Line: | $43.4^{\prime}$ | Left Lot Line: |
| Front Setback: |  | Front Setback: |  | Front Setback: |
| Rear Setback: |  | Rear Setback: |  | Rear Setback: |
| Height: | Height: | Height: |  |  |
| Size: | Size: |  | Size: |  |

Code Sections): $185-113$ B. (3) \& 185-17 E.
Description: Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Sections 185-113 B. (3) and 185-17 E. for the construction of an inground pool forward of the rear wall of the house and not meeting the total side setback requirement. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

June 23, 2023



RN Residential Neighborhood Zoning


The information depicted on this map is representational and should be implied, are provided for the data or its use or interpretation.


## TOWN OF PITTSFORD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS APPLICATION FOR AREA VARIANCE

Submission Date: May 25, 2023
Hearing Date: July 17, 2023
Applicant: Keith R, Miller
Address: 143 South Main Street
Phone: (585) 739-2359 E-Mail: krmiller143@gmail.com
Agent: Northeastern Pool and Spa
(if different than Applicant)
Address: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$ E-Mail: $\qquad$
Property Owner: $\qquad$
Address: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$ E-Mail: $\qquad$
(If applicant is not the property owner please complete the Authorization to Make Application Form.) Property Location: 143 South Main St. Current Zoning: $\qquad$
Tax Map Number: 164.10-4-12

Application For: $\square$ Residential $\square$ Commercial $\square$ Other

Please describe, in detail, the proposed project:
Installing a swimming pool at our home at 143 South Main Street, Pittsford, NY

SWORN STATEMENT: As applicant or legal agent for the above described property, I do hereby swear that all statements, descriptions, and signatures appearing on this form and all accompanying materials are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.



# NEW YORK STATE <br> STANDARDS FOR THE GRANTING OF AREA VARIANCES TOWN LAW SECTION § 267-b-3(b). 

## TESTS FOR GRANTING AREA VARIANCES

In making its determination, the zoning board of appeals shall take into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant. In making such determination, the board shall also consider the following:
(Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge)

1. Please explain why you feel the requested variance will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood and why a detriment to nearby properties will not be created by the granting of this area variance:

The pool design/location is adjacent to existing patio and fits well into property. there is considerable existing trees/bushes/foliage between pool and north neighbor lot. additional landscaping will provide further buffer.
2. Please explain the reasons why the benefit sought by the owner/applicant cannot be achieved by some method other than an area variance:

Set back established by existing property designation. need to have pool 10 feet from existing patio so provides location constraint

## TESTS FOR GRANTING AREA VARIANCES (Continued)

3. Please explain whether the requested area variance is minimal or substantial:

Minimal - no impact on neighborhood.
4. Please explain why you feel the requested area variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental condition in the neighborhood or zoning district:
We only have one neighbor involved and the current landscaping creates natural barrier and maintains seclusion same as exists today.

- NOTE: Consideration of the following question shall be relevant to the decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals, but shall not necessarily prec/ude the granting of an area variance;

5. Is the alleged difficulty self-created?

No. We need a variance based on Town guidelines.


# INSTRUMENT SURVEY <br> / ヌ3 SODTH MAIN STREET PART OF TOUN LOT ZA 

SITUATE IN
TOLU DF DITTSFDRD MONROE CD.


## Zoning Board of Appeals Referral Form Information

## Property Address:

16 Winding Road ROCHESTER, NY 14618

## Property Owner:

Dryer, Jessica
16 Winding Rd
Rochester, NY 14618

## Applicant or Agent:

Dryer, Jessica
16 Winding Rd
Rochester, NY 14618

Present Zoning of Property: RN Residential Neighborhood
Area Variance - Residential and Non-Profit
Town Code Requirement is: Proposed Conditions: Resulting in the Following Variance:
Right Lot Line:
Left Lot Line:
Front Setback:
Rear Setback:
Height:
Size:

Right Lot Line:
Left Lot Line:
50' Front Setback:
Rear Setback:
Height:
Size:

Right Lot Line:
Left Lot Line:
45' Front Setback: 5.0'
Rear Setback:
Height:
Size:

Code Section(s): $\quad 185-17$ B.
Description: Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185-17 B. for the construction of a garage addition extending past the building line. The property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

June 23, 2023


RN Residential Neighborhood Zoning


## TOWN OF PITTSFORD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS APPLICATION FOR AREA VARIANCE

Submission Date: June 15, 2023
Hearing Date: July 17, 2023
Applicant
: Paul Morabito
Address: 121 Sully's Trail Suite 4 Pittsford, NY 14534
Phone: (585) 264-1330 E-Mail: paul@morabitoarchitects.com
Agent: $\qquad$
(if different than Applicant)
Address: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$ E-Mail: $\qquad$
Property Owner: $\frac{\text { Mike and Jessica Mulbury }}{\text { (if different than Applicant) }}$

Address: 16 Winding Rd Pittsford, NY
Phone: (585) 261-6347 E-Mail: mjmulbury@yahoo.com
(If applicant is not the property owner please complete the Authorization to Make Application Form.)
Property Location: 16 Winding Rd Current Zoning:
Tax Map Number: 151.14-1-12
Application For: $\square$ Residential $\square$ Commercial $\square$ Other

Please describe, in detail, the proposed project:
Addition to front, side and rear of residence. Current garage was modified by a previous owner and has limited space for parking vehicles.

SWORN STATEMENT: As applicant or legal agent for the above described property, I do hereby swear that all statements, descriptions, and signatures appearing on this form and all accompanying materials are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

## Paul Morabito

## TOWN OF PITTSFORD

AREA VARIANCE
AUTHORIZATION TO MAKE APPLICATION

Zoning Board of Appeals - 11 S. Main Street - Pittsford, 14534 - 248-6260

> If the applicant is not the owner of the subject property, this form must be completed and signed by the owner.

I, $\qquad$ , the owner of the property located at:

> (Stret)
(Town)
(Zip)

Tax Parcel \# $\qquad$ do hereby authorize to make application to the

Town of Pittsford Zoning Board of Appeals, 11 South Main Street, Pittsford, NY 14534 for the purpose(s) of $\qquad$


## NEW YORK STATE <br> STANDARDS FOR THE GRANTING OF AREA VARIANCES TOWN LAW SECTION § 267-b-3(b).

## TESTS FOR GRANTING AREA VARIANCES

In making its determination, the zoning board of appeals shall take into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant. In making such determination, the board shall also consider the following:
(Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge)

1. Please explain why you feel the requested variance will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood and why a detriment to nearby properties will not be created by the granting of this area variance:

The front expansion is befitting to the design of the original home and enables the owners to park their vehicles in a properly sized garage. It will not impose any desirable views by neighboring properties.
2. Please explain the reasons why the benefit sought by the owner/applicant cannot be achieved by some method other than an area variance:

The garage was modified over time by a previous owner greatly reducing the space required to park vehicles. Bringing the garage forward is the only solution to gain the depth required to fix this.

## TESTS FOR GRANTING AREA VARIANCES (Continued)

3. Please explain whether the requested area variance is minimal or substantial:

The front setback is $50^{\prime}$. The request is for a front setback of $45^{\prime}$ or a $10 \%$ setback variance.
4. Please explain why you feel the requested area variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental condition in the neighborhood or zoning district:

I feel the request is modest and will allow for vehicles to easily be parked within the garage and off the driveway likely preferable to the neighboring homes.

- NOTE: Consideration of the following question shall be relevant to the decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals, but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance;

5. Is the alleged difficulty self-created?

This problem was created by a previous owner.

# Disclosure Form E 

## In the Matter of

(Project Name)
The undersigned, being the applicant(s) to the...
$\square$ Town Board $\square$ Zoning Board of Appeals $\square$ Planning Board $\square$ Architectural Review Board ...of the Town of Pittsford, for a...
$\square$ change of zoning $\quad \square$ special permit $\square$ building permit $\square$ permit $\square$ amendment
$\square$ variance $\quad \square$ approval of a plat $\quad \square$ exemption from a plat or official map
...issued under the provisions of the Ordinances, Local Laws, Rule or Regulations constituting the zoning and planning ordinances regulations of the Town of Pittsford, do hereby certify that I have read the provisions of Section $\S 809$ of the General Municipal Law of the State of New York attached to this certificate.

I do further certify that there is no officer of the State of New York, the County of Monroe or of the Town of Pittsford or of any other municipality of which the Town of Pittsford is a part who is interested in the favorable exercise of discretion by said Board as to this application, except for those named below:

Name(s) $\quad \underline{\text { Address(es) }}$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

$\frac{\text { Paul Morabito }}{\frac{\text { (Signature of Applicant) }}{121 \text { Sully's Trail suite } 4}}$| (Street Address) |
| :--- |
| $\frac{\text { June 15, } 2023}{\text { (Dated) }}$ |
| $\frac{\text { (City/Town, State, Zip Code) }}{}$ |





EXISTING REAR ELEVATION


EXISTING LEFT SIDE ELEVATION

REAR ELEVATION = PROPOSED



LEFT SIDE ELEVATION - PROPOSED





## Zoning Board of Appeals <br> Referral Form Information

## Property Address:

6 Rosewood Drive PITTSFORD, NY 14534

## Property Owner:

Grain, William C 6 Rosewood Dr
Pittsford, NY 14534

## Applicant or Agent:

Grain, William C
6 Rosewood Dr
Pittsford, NY 14534

Present Zoning of Property: RN Residential Neighborhood
Area Variance - Residential and Non-Profit

Town Code Requirement is: Proposed Conditions: Resulting in the Following Variance:

Right Lot Line:
Left Lot Line:
Front Setback:
Rear Setback:
Height:
Size:

Right Lot Line:
Left Lot Line:
50' Front Setback:
Rear Setback:
Height:
Size:

Right Lot Line:
Left Lot Line:
39' Front Setback: 11.0'
Rear Setback:
Height:
Size:

Code Sections): 185-17 B. \& 185-17 D.
Description: Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Sections 185-17 B. and 185-17 D. for the construction of an addition extending past the building line and an unenclosed porch past the allowed façade area. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

June 23, 2023



RN Residential Neighborhood Zoning


TOWN OF PITTSFORD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS APPLICATION FOR AREA VARIANCE

Submission Date: $\qquad$ 6.8.23

Hearing Date: $\qquad$ 7.17 .23

Applicant: MICHELE CRAIN
Address: $\qquad$ 6 Rosewood Dr., Pittsford, N.Y. 14534
Phone: E-Mail: ROMANGCRAIN@GMAIL.COM
Agent: LHEIS HENNESSEY, CKH ARCHIECTURE
Address: 1501 Piltsford Victor RD, suIt 100, Victor, N.Y. 14564
Phone: (585) 249-1334 EMail: CKHENNESSEY © FRONTIERNGT. NGT
Property Owner: $\qquad$
Address: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$ E-Mail: $\qquad$
(If applicant is not the property owner please complete the Authorization to Make Application Form.)
Property Location: $\qquad$ 4 Rosewood DR Current Zoning: $\qquad$ $R N$
Tax Map Number: $\qquad$

Application For:
区
ResidentialCommercialOther

Please describe, in detail, the proposed project:
WE WOULD IKE TO ADD ON TD THE FRONT OF THE HOUSE, SPACE FOR A LARGER OWNERS BEDROOM \& BATHROOM. THOSE ROOMS ARE CURRENTLY LOCATED AT THE FRONT OF THE HOME. ADDTIINNL SPACE TS PROPOSED FOR A LARGER FOYER : SCREENED PORCHES OFF FRONT ROOMS OF HOUSE.

SWORN STATEMENT: As applicant or legal agent for the above described property, I do hereby swear that all statements, descriptions, and signatures appearing on this form and all accompanying materials are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.



## NEW YORK STATE <br> STANDARDS FOR THE GRANTING OF AREA VARIANCES TOWN LAW SECTION § 267-b-3(b).

## TESTS FOR GRANTING AREA VARIANCES

In making its determination, the zoning board of appeals shall take into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant. In making such determination, the board shall also consider the following:
(Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge)

1. Please explain why you feel the requested variance will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood and why a detriment to nearby properties will not be created by the granting of this area variance:

> THE
> PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE FRONT OF THE EXISTING HONS WII NOD INTEREST TO THE FRONT OF THE HOUSE WIT PORCHES, COVERED FRONT ENTRY \& ADDITIONAL WINDOWS WITH SHUTtERS.
2. Please explain the reasons why the benefit sought by the owner/applicant cannot be achieved by some method other than an area variance:

THE EXISTING FLOOR PLAN HAS THE OWNERS BEDROOM \& BATH IN THE FRONT DF THE HOUSE. In HRDER TO ENLARGE THESE SPACES, THE ADDTIION TO ThE FRONT OF THE HOUSE is NECessary.

TESTS FOR GRANTING AREA VARIANCES (Continued)
3. Please explain whether the requested area variance is minimal or substantial:

THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS MINIMAL, ASKING FOR $6^{1}-4^{\prime \prime}$ FOR THE INCREASE IN LIVING SPACE AND AN ADDITIONAL 5 FOR SCREENED PORCHES OFF THE EXISTING FIRST FLOOR OF THE HOME ( $11^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ TOTAL)
4. Please explain why you feel the requested area variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental condition in the neighborhood or zoning district:

ThE REqUESTED VARILNCE IN ThE FRONT OF THE HOME WOULD EXTEND INTO THE FLAT FRONT LAWN. THIS WOULD HAVE NO IMPACT TO DRAINAGE TO THE SOPROONDING PROPERTIES.

- NOTE: Consideration of the following question shall be relevant to the decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals, but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance;

5. Is the alleged difficulty self-created?

ThE DIFFICULTY IS SELF-CREATED IN THAT THE OWNER'S WOULD LYE TO iMPROVE THEIR EXISTING HOME. TO DO THAT WTH THE EXISTING FLOOR PLAN, THE ADDITION MUST COME FORWARD OF THE FRONT OF THE HOME. THE CURB APPEAL WILL BE IMPROVED $\%$ THE PLAN POSITIVE FOR THE oWNERS \& SURROUNDING NEIGHBORS.

PARCEL MAY bE SUBJECT TO UNDERGROUND

CERTIFICATION:
WE, PASSERO ASSOCIATES, P.C., CERTIFY THAT THIS MAP WAS PREPARED NOVEMBER 29, 1988 USING REFERENCE MATERIAL AS LISTED HEREON AND FROM NOTES OF AN INSTRUMENT SURVEY COMPLEEED NOVEMBER 8, 1988. THIS PARCEI IS SUBJBCT TO ANY EASEMENTS OR ENCUMBRANCES OF RECORD. NO CERTIFICATION IS EXTENDED TO RECORD INFORMATION NOT REFERENCED.
PARCEL WAS REINSPECTED ON JUNE 20, 2002, WITH CHANGES ANDIOR ADDITIONS SHOWN HEREON. THIS CERTIFICATION IS MADE TO:

1. THE TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY INSURING THE MORTGAGE
2. FINUCANE AND HARTZELL
3. CHARTER ONE BANK, FSB, ITS SUCCESSORS ANDIOR ASSIGNS
4. MICHELE R. CRAIN AND WILLIAM C. CRAIN
5. PHETERSON, PETERS AND CALABRESE

## INSTRUMENT SURVEY



Abitract By INOEPENOENT TITLE SERUNES

Roforence Dota $\qquad$ 164 of Map: Page $\qquad$ ;



NOTE: 06.20 .02 INSTRUMENT SURVEY REINSPECT.

| CERTAFAGION INOHCATED HEREON MALL PUN OWLY TO THE PEREON POR WHOM THE EUNVEY B PREMAED,AMO | Scole $1 \times .30^{\circ}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| ON HISIFICATIONS ARE NOT TRANBFERARLE TO ADOTIONAL IMATITUTIONS OR SUEAEQUENT | Dato $11 / 29 / 88$ |
| OWMERE. | Drown By |
| UWNTHORAZED NARERATIOW OR ADOOTION TO THIS sub-ovision 2 , of THE WY.B. EDUCATION LAW. | Criecked By |




80 square feet addition
276 square fiet Porch addition




## Zoning Board of Appeals <br> Referral Form Information

## Property Address:

28 Whitestone Lane ROCHESTER, NY 14618

## Property Owner:

Balderston, William III
19 Collinswood Rd
Wilton, CT 06897

## Applicant or Agent:

Stahl Property Associates

Present Zoning of Property: RN Residential Neighborhood Area Variance - Residential and Non-Profit

Town Code Requirement is:
Right Lot Line:
Left Lot Line:
Front Setback:
Rear Setback:
Height:
Size:

Proposed Conditions:
Right Lot Line:
Left Lot Line:
50' Front Setback
Rear Setback:
Height:
Size:

Resulting in the Following Variance:
Right Lot Line:
Left Lot Line:
42'9" Front Setback: 7'3"
Rear Setback:
Height:
Size:

Code Section(s): 185-18B.
Description: Applicant is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185-17 B. for the construction of a three-car garage addition extending past the building line on Malm Lane. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

June 23, 2023


RN Residential Neighborhood Zoning


The information depicted on this map is representational and should be implied, are provided for the data or its use or interpretation.

# TOWN OF PITTSFORD <br> ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS APPLICATION FOR AREA VARIANCE 

Submission Date: June 10, 2023
Hearing Date: June 10, 2023
Applicant: Stahl Property Associates
Address: 345 Kilbourn rd Rochester, NY 14618

Address: 36 Whitestone Ln Rochester, NY 14618
Phone: (585) 820-3924 E-Mail: anmarierizzo@gmail.com
(If applicant is not the property owner please complete the Authorization to Make Application Form.)
Property Location: 28 Whitestone Ln

Current Zoning: Residential Neighborhood
Tax Map Number: 137.200-2-35

Application For: $\square$ Residential $\square$ Commercial $\square$ Other

Please describe, in detail, the proposed project:
Remodeling the house at 28 Whitestone with a Master Bedroom addition and a new garage addition. Due to the 50 ' side setback because it sits on a corner lot we are asking for a $7^{\prime} 33^{\prime \prime}$ variance to 42' 9'。

[^0]


## NEW YORK STATE STANDARDS FOR THE GRANTING OF AREA VARIANCES TOWN LAW SECTION § 267-b-3(b).

## TESTS FOR GRANTING AREA VARIANCES

In making its determination, the zoning board of appeals shall take into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant. In making such determination, the board shall also consider the following:
(Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge)

1. Please explain why you feel the requested variance will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood and why a detriment to nearby properties will not be created by the granting of this area variance:

28 Whitestone is the only house on this side of Malm, therefore there are no other structures to reference the $7^{\prime} 3^{\prime \prime}$ difference that we are requesting (reference zoning map attachment). We feel that by adding on this garage we are creating a more aesthetically pleasing view from Malm. This view is important because the the front elevation of 28 Whitestone is only ever seen by anyone if they are driving down whitestone In toward the dead end cul de sac, and by adding on the proposed garage mass we are adding a visually pleasing view of this property from Malm as well.
2. Please explain the reasons why the benefit sought by the owner/applicant cannot be achieved by some method other than an area variance:

The proposed design has been positively received by the Design Review Board, and this design is not possible to achieve without asking for the proposed variance. Without the variance, the rear of the garage structure would interfere with the main house.

## TESTS FOR GRANTING AREA VARIANCES (Continued)

3. Please explain whether the requested area variance is minimal or substantial:

Our requested variance is minimal. We are asking for a small substraction from the 50 ' setback that has no impact on the neighborhood and improves the view of the side elevation (from Malm) which allows this house to then be viewed in a beneficial way from both Whitestone In and Malm.
4. Please explain why you feel the requested area variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental condition in the neighborhood or zoning district:

Our request of a $7^{\prime} 3^{\prime \prime}$ substraction from the 50 ' setback will allow our proposed garage to be viewed from Malm, adding character via an aesthetically pleasing structure that will enhance this side of Malm (as there are currently no other structures to reference on this side of the street). With a 7' $3^{\prime \prime}$ subtraction of this setback we will not be infringing on any present environmental fixtures and the character of the street will be improved

- NOTE: Consideration of the following question shall be relevant to the decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals, but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance;

5. Is the alleged difficulty self-created?

Yes, but we believe that by asking for this variance we will be adding character to the house as well as to the neighborhood (viewed from both whitestone In and malm). We believe it is the traditional style of this particular house in the Whitestone neighborhood that - through Malm In - complements the traditional style of home seen on Shoreham nicely.
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## DRO3

Garage Side Elevation
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## Zoning Board of Appeals <br> Referral Form Information

## Property Address:

60 Golf Avenue PITTSFORD, NY 14534

## Property Owner:

Town Of Pittsford
11 S Main St
Pittsford, NY 14534

## Applicant or Agent:

BELL ATLANTIC MOBIL SYSTEMS OF ALLENTOWN, INC. D/B/A VERIZON
1275 JOHN STREET
WEST HENRIETTA, NY 14586

Present Zoning of Property: RN Residential Neighborhood
Area Variance - Non-Residential

| Town Code Requirement is: | Proposed Conditions: | Resulting in the Following Variance: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Right Lot Line: | Right Lot Line: | Right Lot Line: |
| Left Lot Line: | Left Lot Line: | Left Lot Line: |
| Front Setback: | Front Setback: | Front Setback: |
| Rear Setback: | Rear Setback: | Rear Setback: |
| Height: | Height: | $125^{\prime}$ |
| Size: | Size: |  |
| Height: |  |  |
| Size: |  |  |

Code Section(s): 185-126 C. (3)(b)[2]
Description: Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems dba Verizon Wireless is requesting relief from Town Code Section 185-126 C. (3) (b)[2] for the construction of a 125 -foot cellular facility (monopole) where the maximum height permitted is 100 feet. This property is zoned Residential Neighborhood (RN).

June 23, 2023

RN Residential Neighborhood Zoning


Jared C. Lusk
Partner

T/585.263.1140
F/866.402.1491
jlusk@nixonpeabody.com

March 28, 2023

## VIA EMAIL AND FEDERAL EXPRESS

Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals
Town of Pittsford
11 South Main Street
Pittsford, New York 14534
azurowski@townofpittsford.org
RE: Application by Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems LLC d/b/a Verizon Wireless for a Special Use Permit and Site Plan Approval from the Town of Pittsford Planning Board and a height variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals to construct and operate a $\mathbf{1 2 5}^{\prime}$ Wireless Telecommunications Facility on Town property located at 60 Golf Avenue in the Town of Pittsford, New York (the "490 and Golf" Cell)

Dear Members of the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals:
Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems LLC d/b/a Verizon Wireless ("Verizon Wireless") is a public utility and wireless telecommunications licensee of the Federal Communications Commission (" $\mathbf{F C C}$ "), responsible for providing wireless telecommunications services to individuals, businesses and emergency services. To remedy service inadequacies in the Town of Pittsford, Verizon Wireless proposes to install and operate a wireless telecommunications tower (the "Project") on property owned by the Town of Pittsford and located at 60 Golf Avenue (Tax Parcel No. 151.15-2-34) in the Town (the "Site").

The Project will consist of a $125^{\prime}$ tall monopole tower (plus $4^{\prime}$ lightning rod), and other associated improvements all as shown on the enclosed site plan prepared by Costich Engineering, P.C. (the "Site Plan").

The Site is located in the Town's Residential Neighborhood (" $\mathbf{R N}$ ") zoning district. In accordance with the requirements of the Zoning Law of the Town of Pittsford (the "Zoning Law"), the Project is permitted upon the issuance of a special use permit and site plan approval from the Town Planning Board (see Zoning Law § 185-126(C)(2)).

In addition, since the proposed tower exceeds $100^{\prime}$, a height variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals is required.

Town of Pittsford Planning Board
March 28, 2023
Page 2

Accordingly, please accept this letter and the following exhibits and enclosures as Verizon Wireless's application for a special use permit and site plan approval from the Town Planning Board and height variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals:

Exhibit A: Completed, Town-supplied application forms;
Exhibit B: Project description;
Exhibit C: Applicable legal standards;
Exhibit D: $\quad$ Proof of compliance with the Town's requirements and standards for Telecommunications towers set forth in Zoning Law § 185-26;

Exhibit E: $\quad$ Proof of compliance with the Town's requirements and standards for special use permits as set forth in Zoning Law § 185-70, et seq.;

Exhibit F: Project compliance with the Town's site plan approval requirements and standards set forth in Zoning Law § 18589 , et seq.;

Exhibit G: Proof of compliance with applicable area variance standards set forth in Town Law § 267-b(3)(b);

Exhibit H: Radio Justification Report with propagation studies;
Exhibit I: Site Selection Analysis;
Exhibit J: Photosimulation Report with viewshed map;
Exhibit K: Verizon Wireless' FCC licenses;
Exhibit L: Proof of Structural Stability;
Exhibit M: Ag Data Statement;
Exhibit N: Environmental assessment form ("EAF") with visual addendum;

Exhibit O: Map showing parcels within 500' of Project;
Exhibit P:
$11^{\prime \prime}$ x $17^{\prime \prime}$ copy of Project Site Plan and vicinity map; and
Exhibit Q: Tower removal estimate.

Town of Pittsford Planning Board
March 28, 2023
Page 3

- Twenty (20) copies of this application book;
- Two (2) full sized copies of the site plan;
- A check made payable to the Town of Pittsford in the amount of $\$ 575$ (site plan application fee of $\$ 400.00$ and special use permit application fee of $\$ 175.00$ ); and
- A check made payable to the Town of Pittsford in the amount of $\$ 165$ for the Town's required area variance fee.

As the Site is located within $500^{\prime}$ of a County or State resource (Interstate 490, County Route 35), this application needs to be referred to the Monroe County Planning Board pursuant to General Municipal Law Section 239-m. An additional set of application materials has been supplied to allow for the Town's referral to County Planning.

Because the Site is within 500' of farm operations in an Agricultural District, as defined under Article 25-AA of the Agriculture and Markets Law, Verizon Wireless has submitted an Agricultural Data Statement pursuant to Town Law § 283-a (see Exhibit M). Section 283-a requires the Town to mail written notice of this application to the landowners identified in that Agricultural Data Statement. Such notice must include a description of the project and its location, and it may be sent in conjunction with any other notice required for the project.

Verizon Wireless asks that this application be placed on the Planning Board's May 8, 2023 meeting agenda for consideration and the Zoning Board's May 15, 2023 meeting.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if the Town requires any additional information or materials, or to discuss the Project.

Thank you.

JCL/mkv


Enclosures

cc: Kathy Pomponio, Project Manager<br>Jackie Bartolotta, Site Acquisition Manager

## TOWN OF PITTSFORD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS APPLICATION FOR AREA VARIANCE

Submission Date: March 24, 2023
Hearing Date: May 15, 2023
Applicant: Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems LLC d/b/a Verizon Wireless
Address: 1275 John Street, Suite 100, West Henrietta, NY 14586
Phone: $\qquad$ E-Mail:

Agent: Jared C. Lusk, Esq., Nixon Peabody LLP, attorneys for Verizon Wireless
Address: 1300 Clinton Square, Rochester, NY 14604
Phone: (585) 263-1140 - Jared Lusk, Esq. E-Mail: jlusk@nixonpeabody.com

Property Owner: Town of Pittsford
(if different than Applicant)
Address: 11 S . Main Street
Phone: (585) 248-6200
E-Mail:
(If applicant is not the property owner please complete the Authorization to Make Application Form.)
Property Location:
60 Golf Avenue
Current Zoning:
RN
Tax Map Number: 151.15-2-34

Application For: $\square$ Residential $\square$ Commercial Other

Please describe, in detail, the proposed project:
Construct and operate a $125^{\prime}$ wireless telecommunications facility, 25 ' taller than permitted under Code.

SWORN STATEMENT: As applicant or legal agent for the above described property, I do hereby swear that all statements, descriptions, ahd signatures appearing on this form and all accompanying materials are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

(Owner or Applicant Signature)
March 24, 2023
Jared C. Lusk, Esq., Nixon Peabody LLP, attorneys for Verizon Wireless

## TESTS FOR GRANTING AREA VARIANCES (Continued)

3. Please explain whether the requested area variance is minimal or substantial:

## See Exhibit G.

4. Please explain why you feel the requested area variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental condition in the neighborhood or zoning district:

## See Exhibit G.

- NOTE: Consideration of the following question shall be relevant to the decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals, but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance;

5. Is the alleged difficulty self-created?

## See Exhibit G.

## EXHIBIT B

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems, LLC d/b/a Verizon Wireless ("Verizon Wireless"), a federally licensed wireless telecommunications provider, currently has service inadequacies in the Town of Pittsford and the surrounding areas, with nearby sites operating at or near exhaustion unable to provide the requisite coverage and requiring an offload of capacity. The only way to remedy this is to locate a wireless telecommunications facility in a technologically appropriate site. The proposed site is located at 60 Golf Avenue in the Town of Pittsford (the "Site"). This application includes, on behalf of Verizon Wireless, a request for a special use permit and site plan approval from the Town Planning Board and a height variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals to construct and operate a wireless telecommunications facility at the Site (the "Proiect") in order to render adequate and reliable wireless telecommunications service to emergency services, businesses and individuals in and around the Town of Pittsford.

The Project will involve the construction of a $125^{\prime}$ tall monopole tower (plus $4^{\prime}$ lightning rod), together with other site improvements as shown on the enclosed site plan prepared by Costich Engineering, P.C.

Wireless telecommunications use has burgeoned since the technology was introduced in the mid-1980s. Wireless telecommunications technology provides a critical link for emergency services, such as ambulances, which use such service to transmit vital signs and medical information via medical telemetry. Increasingly, police forces are relying on wireless telecommunication devices to communicate with dispatch and receive calls for assistance. Additionally, many businesses heavily rely on wireless telecommunications service, and individuals use it not only for their convenience, but for safety reasons as well.

Essentially, wireless telecommunications devices operate by transmitting a very low power radio signal between the wireless telecommunication device and an antenna mounted on a tower, pole, building or other structure. The antenna feeds the signal to electronic apparatus housed in a small equipment shelter located near the antenna (the "Base Station"), where it is connected to an ordinary telephone line, and is then routed anywhere in the world. The antennas and Base Station are known as a "cell site."

Because of the low power, a cell site is capable of transmitting to and from wireless telecommunication devices only within a limited geographic area. This limited geographic area is called a "cell." A cell site must be located within a prescribed area in order to provide coverage for the entire cell.

Wireless telecommunications technology requires that cells overlap somewhat in order to provide uninterrupted service. When the wireless telecommunications user moves into a new cell, the transmission is automatically transferred to the cell site in the new cell. If there is no cell site in the new cell, there is no wireless telecommunications service.

Because each cell site must be placed in such a manner as to provide service within a particular cell, and so as to provide overlapping (but not duplicate) coverage with the existing or planned cells around it, there is limited flexibility as to where a cell site can be placed. Wireless telecommunication providers conduct a thorough engineering study, using an elaborate computer program known as a "propagation study." A propagation study shows, based on cell boundaries, topography and other factors, where a cell site needs to be located in order to provide wireless telecommunications coverage in a particular cell. The wireless telecommunication companies and RF engineers identify technologically feasible locations for the cell site.

As set forth in this application, Verizon Wireless meets the legal standards for receiving a special use permit and site plan approval for the Project. Moreover, the Project will not pollute, will not create noise or vibration, will not create any significant increase in traffic, will not create any environmental problems, will not increase population density, and will not create any demand on governmental facilities. Thus, the Project will not create any detriment to adjoining properties or change the character of the neighborhood. Instead, the Project will enhance governmental facilities and promote the public welfare by providing a modern, more efficient system of communications for police, fire and other emergency services, as well as provide modern wireless telecommunications service to business, industry and individuals.

## EXHIBIT G

## COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPLICABLE AREA VARIANCE STANDARDS


#### Abstract

As discussed in Exhibit C, the legal standard applicable to Verizon Wireless is the relaxed standard afforded to public utilities, rather than the zoning standards generally applied, and this relaxed standard is the same regardless of whether the utility applies for a special use permit, an area variance or any other type of zoning approval. Nonetheless, as demonstrated below, Verizon Wireless also complies with the generally applicable requirements for an area variance.


In determining whether to grant an area variance, the Board must consider the "benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant." Town Law § 267-b 3(b).

In the present case, the benefit for Verizon Wireless would be the ability to fulfill its charge as a public utility and provide essential cellular telephone service to emergency services, businesses and individual users. If the bulk requirements imposed by the Zoning Ordinance are not varied, Verizon Wireless would not be able to properly provide reliable wireless telecommunications service for the 490 and Golf coverage area. This service deficiency would cause users to lose service within the coverage area, including emergency services, businesses and individuals and would be contrary to the Federal goals of proper deployment of this service and Verizon Wireless' FCC license. On the other hand, the only detriment to the neighborhood if the variance is granted would be some ability to see the facility. However, the community would benefit by having access to a modern, reliable cellular communications system, and all towers have become a normal part of the landscape.

## (1) Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of neighborhood or a detriment to the nearby properties will be created by the grant of the variances.

As set forth in this application, the granting of the $25^{\prime}$ variance will not cause any meaningful detriment to the neighborhood or nearby properties and must be balanced against the placement of the tower on Town property adjacent to Interstate 490 (a lower point on the parcel). Reliable service could be provided with a $125^{\prime}$ monopole structure. Also, the Project will not
pollute, will not create noise or vibration, will not increased population density, will not create any demand on governmental services, and will not create any increase in traffic and is not required to be lit. Again, it is an inert facility and, as such, is in harmony with the orderly development of the area as well as the nationwide wireless telecommunications network.
(2) Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some feasible method other than the area variances.

Applicant can only achieve the minimum necessary service coverage needs for this area with a monopole structure of $121^{\prime}$. If the area variance is not granted, Applicant will not be able to provide reliable service to this area from that location.

## (3) Whether the requested area variance is substantial.

Applicant submits that the extra $25^{\prime}$ is insubstantial given the surrounding infrastructure limiting its overall visibility.
(4) Whether the proposed variances will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.

As discussed above, an extra $25^{\prime}$ on top of the tower will not have any adverse effects or impacts, and will not be noticeable to the casual observer. Furthermore, the Project will enhance the public health, safety, welfare and convenience by providing a modern, more efficient system of communications for police, fire and other emergency services, as well as by providing modern wireless telecommunications service to business, industry and individuals.
(5) Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created which determination with consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals, but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance.

As explained above, Verizon Wireless' need for an extra $25^{\prime}$ is due to the coverage requirements and the location desired by the Town on its property.

## Verizon Wireless Communications Facility

## Engineering Necessity Case -"490 \& Golf"



Existing St. John Fisher Site
Existing E. Rochester Site
Town of Perinton
Existing White Haven Site
Project Location (490\&Golf)
Existing Pittsford Site
Existing Pittsford DT Site
Existing 490 \& 31 Site
Prepared by: Michael R. Crosby, RF Engineer IV, Verizon Wireless
Project: The project is the installation and operation of a new tower co-located wireless telecommunications site in the Town of Pittsford (the "Project Facility").

## Introduction

The purpose of this subsequent analysis is to summarize and communicate the technical radio frequency (RF) information used in the justification of this new site.

Coverage and/or capacity deficiencies are the two main drivers that prompt the need for a new wireless communications facility/site. All sites provide a mixture of both capacity and coverage for the benefit of the end user.

Coverage can be defined as the existence of signal of usable strength and quality in an area, including but not limited to in-vehicles or in-buildings.

The need for improved coverage is identified by RF Engineers that are responsible for developing and maintaining the network. RF Engineers utilize both theoretical and empirical data sets (propagation maps and real world coverage measurements). Historically, coverage improvements have been the primary justification of new sites.

Capacity can be defined as the amount of traffic (voice and data) a given site can process before significant performance degradation occurs.

When traffic volume exceeds the capacity limits of a site serving a given area, network reliability and user experience degrades. Ultimately this prevents customers from making/receiving calls, applications cease functioning, internet connections time out and data speeds fail. This critical condition is more important than just a simple nuisance for some users. Degradation of network reliability and user experience can affect emergency responders and to persons in a real emergency situation can literally mean life or death.
*Note that, while Verizon Wireless provides sufficient evidence to establish the existence of a coverage gap and capacity need in this case, the FCC recently confirmed that federal law does not require a provider to establish the existence of a coverage/capacity gap to establish the need for a site. There are several ways by which an applicant can establish site need. See Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment," FCC 18133, 85 FR 51867, at 937 (October 15, 2018) (confirming that the test for establishing an effective prohibition is whether "a state or local legal requirement materially inhibits a provider's ability to engage in any of a variety of activities related to its provision of a covered service," and this test is met "not only when filling a coverage gap but also when densifying a wireless network, introducing new services or otherwise improving service capabilities") (emphasis added).

## Project Need Overview

The project area, located in the north-eastern portion of the Town of Pittsford is currently served by three sites. These sites are overloaded requiring capacity relief. Additionally the project area is subject to significant terrain and or foliage challenges for RF (signal) propagation. This terrain and or foliage combined with long distance prevent effective propagation of Verizon's RF signals into this area compounding the capacity issue with areas of variable coverage creating significant gaps in coverage.

The first serving site is East Rochester, located in the Village of East Rochester, is approximately one and one half miles north east (of the project location) situated on an existing water tower located off West Maple Ave. While this site provides weak/variable coverage in portions of the project area, it does so from a terrain and or foliage + distance challenged position making the site not capable of efficiently or effectively providing adequate coverage or capacity.

The second serving site is Pittsford, located in the Town of Pittsford, is approximately one mile west (of the project location) on an existing tower off 31 (Monroe Ave). While this site provides weak/variable coverage in portions of the project area, it does so from a terrain and or foliage + distance challenged position making the site not capable of efficiently or effectively providing adequate coverage or capacity.

The third serving site is White Haven, located in the Town of Perinton, is approximately one and one quarter miles east (of the project location) situated on an existing tower at White Haven Memorial Park off Marsh Rd. While this site provides weak/variable coverage in portions of the project area, it does so from a terrain and or foliage + distance challenged position making the site not capable of efficiently or effectively providing adequate coverage or capacity.

Available (mid band AWS) carriers at these and other area sites are not capable of effectively serving/offloading the project area due to inherent propagation losses from distance, challenging terrain and in building coverage losses negatively impacting mid band coverage and capacity offload capabilities. There are other Verizon sites in this general area but due to distance and terrain they also do not provide any significant overlapping coverage in the area in question that could allow for increased capacity and improved coverage from other sources.

The primary objectives for this project are to increase capacity and provide and or improve coverage throughout the north-eastern portion of the Town of Pittsford, more specifically portions of I-490, Golf Ave, Washington Rd, North Main St, Random Woods, New England Dr, Landsdowne Ln, Cranswick Ln, Duxbury Way, Oak Manor Ln, KirkLees Rd, Shire Oaks Dr, Charmwood Rd, Callingham Rd, Marsh Rd, Arlington Dr, Wood Creek Dr, Creek Ridge, Monroe Golf Club, as well as neighboring residential and commercial areas along and near these roads. In order to offload capacity from East Rochester, Pittsford and White Haven, a new dominant server must be created. This new dominant coverage will effectively offload the existing overloaded sites/cells as well as provide improved coverage where significant gaps exist today.

Following the search for co-locatable structures to resolve the aforementioned challenges and finding none available, Verizon proposes to attach the necessary antenna(s) to a new 125' tower located at 60 Golf Ave, Pittsford, NY 14534. Verizon's antennas will utilize 121' for the ACL (Antenna Center Line) with a top of antenna height of 125 '. This solution is the minimum height necessary to provide the coverage and capacity improvements needed.

## Wireless LTE (Voice and Data) Growth

Wireless smart city solutions are being used to track available parking and minimize pollution and wasted time.
These same solutions are being used to track pedestrian and bike traffic to help planning and minimize accidents

Smart, wireless connected lighting enables cities to control lighting remotely, saving energy and reducing energy costs by $20 \%$.
4G technology is utilized to track and plan vehicle deliveries to minimize travel, maximize efficiency, and minimize carbon footprint.

4G technology is also used to monitor building power usage down to the circuit level remotely, preventing energy waste and supporting predictive maintenance on machines and equipment.

Wireless sensors placed in shipments are being used to track temperature-sensitive medications, equipment, and food. This is important for preventing the spread of food-borne diseases that kill 3,000 Americans each year.

Source: Verizon Innovation Center, February. 2018

Wireless is a critical component in schools and for today's students.

20,000 learning apps are available for iPads. $72 \%$ of iTunes top selling educational apps are designed for preschoolers and elementary students.600+ school districts replaced text books with tablets in classrooms.

77\% of parents think tablets are beneficial to kids.

74\% of school administrators feel digital content increases student engagement.

| A wireless network is like |
| :--- |
| a highway system... |

## Wireless facilities and property values.

Cell service in and around the home has emerged as a critical factor in home-buying decisions.


National studies demonstrate that most home buyers value good cell service over many other factors including the proximity of schools when purchasing a home.

```
\(75 \%\)
\(5 \%\)
```

More than $75 \%$ of prospective home buyers said a good cellular connection was important to them. ${ }^{1}$

The same study showed that $83 \%$ of Millennials (those born between
1982 and 2004) said cell service was 1982 and 2004) said cell service was
the most important fact in purchasing
a home.

## 83\%

$90 \%$ of U.S. households use wireless
$70 \%$ of teens use cellphones to help with homework.
Source: CTIA's Infographics Today's Wireless Family, October, 2017


The average North American smartphone user will consume 48 GB of data per month in 2023, up from just 5.2 GB per month in 2016 and 7.1 GB per month in 2017 . ${ }^{1}$

Of American homes are wireless only. ${ }^{2}$

In North America, the average household has 13 connected devices with smartphones outnumbering tablets 6 to $1 .^{3}$

EnicssonMobility Report, November 2017
CDS Marke


With over $80 \%$ of 9-1-1 calls now coming
from cell phones... ${ }^{1}$

911 calls are made annually. In many areas, $80 \%$ or more are from wireless devices. ${ }^{1}$

## Explanation of Wireless Capacity



Capacity in this analysis is evaluated with up to three metrics further explained below. These metrics assist in determining actual usage for a given site as well as are used to project when a site is expected to run out of capacity (i.e. reach a point of exhaustion where it can no longer process the volume of voice and data requested by local wireless devices, thus no longer providing adequate service).

- Forward Data Volume ("FDV"), is a measurement of usage (data throughput) on a particular site over a given period of time.
- Average Schedule Eligible User ("ASEU"), is a measurement of the loading of the control channels and systems of a given site.
- Average Active Connections ("AvgAC") is a measurement of the number of devices actively connected to a site in any given time slot.

Verizon Wireless uses proprietary algorithms developed by a task force of engineers and computer programmers to monitor each site in the network and accurately project and identify when sites will approach their capacity limits. Using a rolling two-year window for projected exhaustion dates allows enough time, in most cases, to develop and activate a new site. It is critical that these capacity approaching sectors are identified early and the process gets started and completed in time for new solutions (sites) to be on air before network issues impact the customers.

## Capacity Utilization FDV (East Rochester Gamma)



Summary: This graph shows FDV (Forward Data Volume) which is a measurement of the customer data usage that this sector currently serves. As this limit is approached, data rates slow to unacceptable levels, potentially causing unreliable service for Verizon Wireless customers.

The purple line represents the daily max busy hour 700 MHz utilization and the dark red line is daily max busy hour AWS utilization on the Gamma sector of the East Rochester site. The red dashed line is the limit where the sector reaches exhaustion and service starts to significantly degrade. The point in time where we see the purple or dark red lines reach or exceed the red dashed line is when service quickly degrades as usage continues to increase.

Detail: The existing East Rochester sector shown above has exceeded its capability of supporting FDV requirements as shown by the purple and dark red lines exceeding the max utilization threshold (red dashed line). In order to provide adequate and reliable service to Pittsford and the surrounding project area, network densification is required.

## Capacity Utilization ASEU (East Rochester Gamma)




#### Abstract

Summary: This graph shows ASEU (Average Schedule Eligible User). ASEU is a measurement of the loading of the control channels and systems of a given site. The ASEU load is heavily impacted by distant users or those in poor RF conditions.

The purple line represents the daily max busy hour 700 MHz utilization and the dark red line is daily max busy hour AWS utilization on the Gamma sector of the East Rochester site. The red dashed line is the limit where the sector reaches exhaustion and service starts to significantly degrade. The point in time where we see the purple or dark red lines reach or exceed the red dashed line is when service quickly degrades as usage continues to increase.


Detail: The existing East Rochester sector shown above is currently performing normally for the ASEU metric. ASEU is one of three capacity KPl's used to determine capacity capability in this document. Whether forecasted exhaustion is predicted or historical exhaustion is already experienced only one of the three capacity KPl's are needed per site to justify the need for capacity relief for the sector in question. While this chart does not display historical exhaustion it does show the relative traffic loading between low band and mid band revealing the disparity in coverage capabilities experienced in larger footprint cells and resolved by network densification efforts.

## Capacity Utilization AvgAC (East Rochester Gamma)



Summary: This graph shows AvgAC (Average Active Connections). AvgAC utilization by carrier is a measurement of max active connection capacity per sector in any given time slot. When this limit is reached, no additional devices will be able to connect to the site, resulting in connection failures and dropped calls.

The purple line represents the daily max busy hour 700 MHz utilization and the dark red line is daily max busy hour AWS utilization on the Gamma sector of the East Rochester site. The red dashed line is the limit where the sector reaches exhaustion and service starts to significantly degrade. The point in time where we see the purple or dark red lines reach or exceed the red dashed line is when service quickly degrades as usage continues to increase.

Detail: The existing East Rochester sector shown above is currently performing normally for the AvgAC metric. AvgAC is one of three capacity KPl's used to determine capacity capability in this document. Whether forecasted exhaustion is predicted or historical exhaustion is already experienced only one of the three capacity KPl's are needed per site to justify the need for capacity relief for the sector in question. While this chart does not display historical exhaustion it does show the relative traffic loading between low band and mid band revealing the disparity in coverage capabilities experienced in larger footprint cells and resolved by network densification efforts.

## Capacity Utilization FDV (Pittsford Beta)



Summary: This graph shows FDV (Forward Data Volume) which is a measurement of the customer data usage that this sector currently serves. As this limit is approached, data rates slow to unacceptable levels, potentially causing unreliable service for Verizon Wireless customers.

The purple line represents the daily max busy hour 700 MHz utilization and the dark red line is daily max busy hour AWS utilization on the Beta sector of the Pittsford site. The red dashed line is the limit where the sector reaches exhaustion and service starts to significantly degrade. The point in time where we see the purple or dark red lines reach or exceed the red dashed line is when service quickly degrades as usage continues to increase.

Detail: The existing Pittsford sector shown above has exceeded its capability of supporting FDV requirements as shown by the purple and dark red lines exceeding the max utilization threshold (red dashed line). In order to provide adequate and reliable service to Pittsford and the surrounding project area, network densification is required.

## Capacity Utilization ASEU (Pittsford Beta)



Detail: The existing Pittsford sector shown above has exceeded its capability of supporting FDV requirements as shown by the purple line exceeding the max utilization threshold (red dashed line). In order to provide adequate and reliable service to Pittsford and the surrounding project area, network densification is required.

## Capacity Utilization AvgAC (Pittsford Beta)



Summary: This graph shows AvgAC (Average Active Connections). AvgAC utilization by carrier is a measurement of max active connection capacity per sector in any given time slot. When this limit is reached, no additional devices will be able to connect to the site, resulting in connection failures and dropped calls.

The purple line represents the daily max busy hour 700 MHz utilization and the dark red line is daily max busy hour AWS utilization on the Beta sector of the Pittsford site. The red dashed line is the limit where the sector reaches exhaustion and service starts to significantly degrade. The point in time where we see the purple or dark red lines reach or exceed the red dashed line is when service quickly degrades as usage continues to increase.

Detail: The existing Pittsford sector shown above has exceeded its capability of supporting AvgAC requirements as shown by the purple line exceeding the max utilization threshold (red dashed line). In order to provide adequate and reliable service to Pittsford and the surrounding project area, network densification is required.

## Capacity Utilization FDV (White Haven Gamma)



Summary: This graph shows FDV (Forward Data Volume) which is a measurement of the customer data usage that this sector currently serves. As this limit is approached, data rates slow to unacceptable levels, potentially causing unreliable service for Verizon Wireless customers.

The purple line represents the daily max busy hour 700 MHz utilization and the dark red line is daily max busy hour AWS utilization on the Gamma sector of the White Haven site. The red dashed line is the limit where the sector reaches exhaustion and service starts to significantly degrade. The point in time where we see the purple or dark red lines reach or exceed the red dashed line is when service quickly degrades as usage continues to increase.

Detail: The existing White Haven sector shown above has exceeded its capability of supporting FDV requirements as shown by the purple and dark red lines exceeding the max utilization threshold (red dashed line). In order to provide adequate and reliable service to Pittsford and the surrounding project area, network densification is required.

## Capacity Utilization ASEU (White Haven Gamma)



Summary: This graph shows ASEU (Average Schedule Eligible User). ASEU is a measurement of the loading of the control channels and systems of a given site. The ASEU load is heavily impacted by distant users or those in poor RF conditions.

The purple line represents the daily max busy hour 700 MHz utilization and the dark red line is daily max busy hour AWS utilization on the Gamma sector of the White Haven site. The red dashed line is the limit where the sector reaches exhaustion and service starts to significantly degrade. The point in time where we see the purple or dark red lines reach or exceed the red dashed line is when service quickly degrades as usage continues to increase.

Detail: The existing White Haven sector shown above is currently performing normally for the ASEU metric. ASEU is one of three capacity KPl's used to determine capacity capability in this document. Whether forecasted exhaustion is predicted or historical exhaustion is already experienced only one of the three capacity KPl's are needed per site to justify the need for capacity relief for the sector in question. While this chart does not display historical exhaustion it does show the relative traffic loading between low band and mid band revealing the disparity in coverage capabilities experienced in larger footprint cells and resolved by network densification efforts.

## Capacity Utilization AvgAC (White Haven Gamma)



> Summary: This graph shows AvgAC (Average Active Connections). AvgAC utilization by carrier is a measurement of max active connection capacity per sector in any given time slot. When this limit is reached, no additional devices will be able to connect to the site, resulting in connection failures and dropped calls.
> The purple line represents the daily max busy hour 700MHz utilization and the dark red line is daily max busy hour AWS utilization on the Gamma sector of the White Haven site. The red dashed line is the limit where the sector reaches exhaustion and service starts to significantly degrade. The point in time where we see the purple or dark red lines reach or exceed the red dashed line is when service quickly degrades as usage continues to increase.

Detail: The existing White Haven sector shown above is currently performing normally for the Avg AC metric. Avg AC is one of three capacity KPl's used to determine capacity capability in this document. Whether forecasted exhaustion is predicted or historical exhaustion is already experienced only one of the three capacity KPl's are needed per site to justify the need for capacity relief for the sector in question.

## Explanation of Wireless Coverage



Coverage is best shown via coverage maps. RF engineers use computer simulation tools that take into account terrain, vegetation, building types, and site specifics to model the RF environment. This model is used to simulate the real world network and assist engineers to evaluate the impact of a proposed site (along with industry experience and other tools).

Many Verizon Wireless sites provide 4G LTE at 700 MHz and 850 MHz . As capacity requirements increase, higher frequency (and bandwidth) PCS ( 1900 MHz ) and AWS ( 2100 MHz ) carriers are added. In some mountaintop or long distance situations the mid band (higher frequency) AWS and PCS carriers are not fully effective due to excessive distance (path loss) from the user population.

Coverage provided by a given site is affected by the frequencies used. Lower frequencies propagate further distances, and are less attenuated by clutter than higher frequencies. To provide similar coverage levels at higher frequencies, a denser network of sites is required (network densification).

Note the affect of clutter on the predicted coverage footprint above
**Dark Green >/=-75dBm RSRP, typically serves dense urban areas as well as areas of substantial construction (colleges, hospitals, dense multi family etc.) Green $>/=-85 \mathrm{dBm}$ RSRP, typically serves suburban single family residential and light commercial buildings
Yellow $>/=-95 \mathrm{dBm}$ RSRP, typically serves most rural/suburban-residential and in car applications
Orange $>/=-105 \mathrm{dBm}$ RSRP, rural highway coverage, subject to variable conditions including fading and seasonality gaps
White $=<-105 \mathrm{dBm}$ RSRP, variable to no reliable coverage gap area
More detailed, site-specific coverage slides are later in the presentation
*Signal strength requirements vary as dictated by specific market conditions
** Not displayed in example map, layer not used in all site justifications

## Explanation of 490 \& Golf Search Area



## 490 \& Golf Search Area

A Search Area is the geographical area within which a new site is targeted to solve a coverage or capacity deficiency. Three of the factors taken into consideration when defining a search area are topography, user density, and the existing network.

- Topography must be considered to minimize the obstacles between the proposed site and the target coverage area. For example, a site at the bottom of a ridge will not be able to cover the other side from a certain height.
- In general, the farther from a site the User Population is, the weaker the RF conditions are and the worse their experience is likely to be. These distant users also have an increased impact on the serving site's capacity. In the case of a multi sector site, centralized proximity is essential to allow users to be evenly distributed and allow efficient utilization of the site's resources.
- The existing Network Conditions also guide the design of a new site. Sites placed too close together create interference due to overlap and are an inefficient use of resources. Sites that are too tall or not properly integrated with existing sites cause interference and degrade service for existing users.
- Existing co-locatable structures inside the search area as well as within a reasonable distance of the search area are submitted by site acquisition and reviewed by RF Engineering. If possible, RF will make use of existing or nearby structures before proposing to build new towers.

To resolve the coverage and capacity deficiencies previously detailed, Verizon Wireless is seeking to add one new cell facility within this area to improve wireless service capacity and coverage. By providing a new dominant signal area and offloading weak and distant traffic from East Rochester, Pittsford and White Haven with the proposed site, adequate and reliable service will be restored. The new 490 \& Golf site will provide dominant and dedicated signal to the identified portions of the Town of Pittsford. This helps to improve not only the 490 \& Golf project area but will also result with significant improvements to the above mentioned overloaded sites ultimately improving community wide areas in and around the 490 \& Golf project area.




|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }_{\text {4 }}^{490}$ \& E Golf |  | 7714 |
|  | 24.2520 |  |  |







## AGRICULTURAL DATA STATEMENT

(pursuant to NY Ag \& Mkt Law 305-a; N.Y. Town Law \& 283-a; N.Y. Village Law § 7-739 and N.Y. Gen. Mun. Law 239-m)

Applicant

| Name: | Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems, LLC <br> $\mathrm{d} / \mathrm{b} / \mathrm{a}$ Verizon Wireless |
| :--- | :--- |
| Address: | 1275 John Street, Suite 100 |
|  | West Henrietta, NY 14586 |

Owner (if different from applicant)
Name: Town of Pittsford
Address: 11 S . Main Street
Pittsford, NY 14534

1. Type of Application: $\boxtimes$ Special Use Permit Site Plan Approval Height Variance(s) Use Variance Subdivision Approval
2. Description of proposed project: Construction and operation of a $125^{\prime}$ wireless telecommunications tower and related improvements.
3. Location of proposed project: Address: 60 Golf Avenue Road

Tax Map No.: 151.15-2-34
4. List all farm operations which are both: (i) located within 500 feet of the boundary of the property upon which the project is proposed, and (ii) located in an agricultural district:

SEE ATTACHED
5. Attach a tax map or other map showing the site of the proposed project relative to the location of farm operations identified above. SEE ATTACHED

Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems, LLC d/b/a Verizon Wireless


## Short Environmental Assessment Form Part 1 - Project Information

## Instructions for Completing

Part 1 - Project Information. The applicant or project sponsor is responsible for the completion of Part 1. Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification. Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information.

Complete all items in Part 1. You may also provide any additional information which you believe will be needed by or useful to the lead agency; attach additional pages as necessary to supplement any item.

| Part 1 - Project and Sponsor Information <br> Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems, LLC d/b/a Verizon Wireless |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Name of Action or Project: <br> 490 \& Golf Telecommunications Facility |  |  |  |  |
| Project Location (describe, and attach a location map): <br> 60 Golf Avenue, Pittsford, NY 14534, Town of Pittsford, Monroe County (T.A.\#151.15-2-34, 7.4 +/- acres per tax map) |  |  |  |  |
| Brief Description of Proposed Action: <br> Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems, LLC d/o/a Verizon Wireless is proposing the construction of a wireless telecommunications facility. The facility will consist of a 125 ' monopole tower (with proposed 4' lightning rod) that will contain a Verizon Wireless antenna array at a centerline $121^{\prime}$ AGL, and outdoor equipment cabinets and H -frame within a $30^{\prime} \times 50^{\prime}+/$ - chain link fence enclosure ( $6^{\prime}$ tall with barbed wire top). The wireless telecommunications equipment, meterboard, transformer and fenced compound are all proposed to be located within a $10,000 \mathrm{SF}$ lease area. Access to the site will utilize an existing asphalt parking lot and existing gravel driveway extending from Golf Avenue. |  |  |  |  |
| Name of Applicant or Sponsor: <br> Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems, LLC d/b/a Verizon Wireless |  | Telephone: 585-943-2623 |  |  |
|  |  | E-Mail: kathy.pomponio@verizon |  |  |
| Address: <br> 1275 John Street, Suite 100 |  |  |  |  |
| City/PO: State: Zip Cod <br> West Henrietta NY 14586 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the proposed action only involve the legislative adoption of a plan, local law, ordinance, administrative rule, or regulation? <br> If Yes, attach a narrative description of the intent of the proposed action and the environmental resources that may be affected in the municipality and proceed to Part 2 . If no, continue to question 2. |  |  | NO | YES |
| 2. Does the proposed action require a permit, approval or funding from any other government Agency? <br> If Yes, list agency(s) name and permit or approval: Town of Pittsford Planning Board-Special Permit \& Site Plan Approval; Town of Pittsford Zoning Board-Height Variance; Historic Preservation Board review and recommendation |  |  | NO | YES |
| 3. a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action? <br> b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed? <br> c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor? |  | $7.4+/-$ acres $0.11+/-$ acres $0.75+/-$ acres |  |  |
| 4. Check all land uses that occur on, are adjoining or near the proposed action: <br> $\begin{array}{lll}\text { 5. } \square \text { Urban } \square \text { Rural (non-agriculture) } & \square \text { Industrial } \square \text { Commercial } \square \text { Residential (suburban) } \\ \square \text { Forest } \square \text { Agriculture } & \square \text { Aquatic } \quad \square & \text { Othcr(Spccify): Cemetery; Town DPW, Railroad Tracks } \\ \square \text { Parkland } & & \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |





Part 1 / Question 7 [Critical Environmental No
Area]
Part 1 / Question 12a [National or State
Register of Historic Places or State Eligible
Sites]

Part 1 / Question 12b [Archeological Sites] No
Part 1 / Question 13a [Wetlands or Other Yes - Digital mapping information on local and federal wetlands and Regulated Waterbodies] waterbodies is known to be incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.
Part 1 / Question 15 [Threatened or
Endangered Animal]

Part 1 / Question 16 [100 Year Flood Plain] No
Part 1 / Question 20 [Remediation Site] No

| This form may be used to provide additional information relating to Question 11 of Part 2 of the Full EAF. (To be completed by Lead Agency) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Visibility | Distance Between <br> Project and Resource (in Miles) |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Would the project be visible from: | 0-1/4 | 1/4-1/2 | 1/2-3 | 3-5 | $5+$ |
| A.)A parcel of land which is dedicated to and available to the public for the use, enjoyment and appreciation of natural or man-made scenic qualities? | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| B.)An overlook or parcel of land dedicated to public observation, enjoyment and appreciation of natural or manmade scenic qualities? | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| C.)A site or structure listed on the National or State Registers of Historic Places? | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| D.)State Parks? | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| E.)The State Forest Preserve? | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| F.)National Wildlife Refuges and state game refuges? | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| G.) National Natural Landmarks and other outstanding natural features? | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| H.)National Park Service lands? | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| J.)Rivers designated as National or State Wild, Scenic or Recreational? | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| K.)Any transportation corridor of high exposure, such as part of the Interstate System, or Amtrak? | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| L.)A governmentally established or designated interstate or inter-county foot trail, or one. formally proposed for establishment or designation? | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| M.)A site, area, lake, reservoir or highway designated as scenic? | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| N.)Municipal park, or designated open space? | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| P.)County road? * | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| R.)State? * | $\square$ | $\square$ | ■ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| S.)Local road? * | - | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| 2. Is the visibility of the project seasonal? (i.e. screened by summer foliage, but visible during other seasons? Yes <br> - No |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Are any of the resources checked in questions 1 used by the public during the time of year during which the project will be visible? <br> Yes No |  |  |  |  |  |



[^1]
## SUPPLEMENTAL DATA FOR VISUAL EAF ADDENDUM

R.) State Roads

| State Roads | Distance Between Project and <br> Resource (Miles) |
| :--- | :---: |
| I-490 | $0.04-0.61$ |
| SR 53 Washington Rd. | 0.31 |

P.) County Roads

| County Roads | Distance Between Project and <br> Resource (Miles) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Golf Ave | $0.06-0.29$ |

S.) Locàl Roads

| Local Roads | Distance Between Project and <br> Resource (Miles) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Torwood Cr. | 0.15 |
| Random Woods | $0.18-.032$ |
| Oak Manor Ln. | $0.10-0.23$ |
| Trowbridge Ln. | $0.18-0.37$ |
| Creek Ridge | 0.52 |
| Wood Creek Ln. | 0.57 |
| Rainberry | 0.55 |

6. Established by assuming a percentage of travelers within the viewshed who will actually observe the project. ADT information taken from NYSDOT Traffic Data Viewer.

State Roads

| 发 | ADT $\times$ \% | = Est. \# of Viewers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-490 | $73600 \times .10$ | 7360 |
| Total Average Daily Viewers |  | $=7360$ |
|  |  | x 365 days per year |
| Total Estimated Viewers per |  | $=2,686,400 / y_{\text {ear }}{ }^{*}$ |






TITLE REVIEW
 FFFECTIVE DATE APRLL 22. 2021. SCHEDULE
PERTNENT TTMS) DETEMMINATIONS ARE:
12. EASEMEN GRANTTD BY YOHN G. BEER LAVIIA M. BEER WILLLAM E. BEER

 THE CENTER OFTHE HIGHWAYY EASEMENT
PROPOSED ACCESS OR LEASE PARCEL.

DESCRIPTION OF LEASE PARCEL


 Follows:


,

. N21020249"W, A DISTANCE OF 116.12 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE

 NTERSTATE ROUTE 490 A DISTANCE OF 134.OO FEET TO THE POIN
BEGINNING. CONTANNG 0.230 CCRES OF LAND, MORE OR LESS

## SURVEY REFERENCES




\section*{| PITTSFORD CORS STATION |
| :--- |
| - LATITUDE: $33-05-35.48461$ (N) |}


2. PER THE NYYDEC FRESHWATER WETLANDS MAP, THERE ARE NO STATE
3. PER THE NATIONAL WEETANDS INVENTORYMAPS, THERE ARE EEDERAL
4. PER THE ERSIIFEMA PROUECT IMPACT HAZARD INFORMATION AND
AMARENESS SITE MAP THRRE IS NO 100 YR. LLOOO PLAIN IN THE PROJECT
AREA. AREA.
5. PERA S SuvVE MAP PREPARED BY CLOUGH, HARBOR \& ASSOCIATES L.LP.
6. PERA AA CERTIFICATION LETTER PREPARED BY COSTICH ENGINEERING
. STEWART TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY, TTILE No. 71153084 , HAVING AN

DESCRIPTION OF ACCESS EASEMENT
ALL THAT TRACT OR PARCEL OF LAND SITUATE IN THE TOWN OF
PITTSFORD, COUNTY OF MONROE, STATE OF NEW YORK, ALL AS SHOWN ONA MAP ENTITLLED $490 \&$ GOLF PROJECT \# 20192073613 SCHEMATIC
 EEING MORE PARTCULARLY BOUNDED AND DESCRIBED AS FOLOWS: COMMENCING AT A POINT ON THE ASSUMED WESTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY
LINE OF INTERSTATE ROUTE A9O BEING ON THE ASSUMED COMMON IINE OF NTERSATE ROUN LAODENO N THE ASSUMEOCOMMON

A. S8193305"W, AND ALONG THE AFOREMENTIONED ASSUMED COMMON
PROPRRTY LINE A ISTANCE OF 81.97 FEET TO THE POINT AND PLACE OF
beGinning; THENC

1. S81 ${ }^{\circ} 33^{\circ} 05{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{W}$, A DISTANCE OF 20.49 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE
2. N2100249"'W, A DISTANCE OF 18.72 FEET TO A POINT. THENCE 3. S83²0050"W A AISTANCE OF 327.68 FEET TO A POINT: THENCE
3. $888^{\circ} 8^{28111 " W}$ A DISTANCE OF 83.52 FEET TO A POINT. THENCE 5. S81010'42"'W, A DISTANCE OF 532.90 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE 6. S62²4' $17^{17 W}$ W A DISTANCE OF 50.53 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE 7. $579^{\circ} 0844^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}$, A DISTANCE OF 19.73 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE 8. NO6"26555"W, A DISTANCE OF 20.06 FEET TO A POINT: THENCE 9. N7908844"E, A DISTANCE OF 15.30 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE
 1. N81 $1{ }^{1} 1042^{\prime \prime}$ E, A DISTANCE OF 537 ..96 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE 12. $588^{\circ} 28^{\prime \prime} 11^{\prime \prime}$ E, A DISTANCE OF 83.90 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE 13. N83202050"E, A DISTANCE OF 301.87 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE 14. N31¹433'33"E, A DISTANCE OF 23.41 FEET TO A POINT: THENCE 15. N21020249"W, A DISTANCE OF 53.34 FEET TO A POINT; THENCE 16. N6895711"E, A DISTANCE OF 20.00 FEET TO A POINT: THENCE 17. S2102924"E, A DISTANCE OF 116.12 FEET TO THE POINT AND PLACE OF
BEGINNING.


E
Costich
ENGINERING


RRCHIECTUR

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | $0^{039332023}$ | AJL |  |
| 1 | 103322023 | AJL | Issuef final |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

drawn By
$\underset{\text { COPYRIGHT 2023 }}{\text { COSTICH ENGINERRING. D.P.C. }}$
COSTICH ENGINEERING, D.P.C.

490 \& GOLF
PROJECT\#: 20192073613
TOWN OF PITTSFORD COUNTY OF MONROE

SURVEY NOTES \& DESCRIPTIONS










RECPS






EROSION CONTROL BLANKET - BANK STABILIZATION (AA53) SCALE:NTS




1. UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES MAY WASH WATER FROM THESE VEHICLES BE ALLOWED TO ENTER ANY SURFACE WATERS



 CONCRETE WASHOUT MAY BE DRECT SEEDED AT THE TIME OF INSTALLATION,
THE SHOUL BE N IN A CONVENENT LOCATON FOR THE TRUCKS, PREFERABLY NEAR THE PLACE WHERE THE CONCRETE . $\begin{aligned} & \text { BEING POURED. } \\ & \text { CONCRETE WASHOUT NOT TO BE LESS THAN } \\ & 6\end{aligned}$
(CA503) CONCRETE WASHOUT DETAIL
verizon


區$\underset{\substack{\text { CNNL } \\ \text { ENEERERG }}}{ }$
 ARCHIECTURE
COSTICH
ENGINEERING



| COPYRIGHT 2023 |
| :---: |
| COSTICH ENGINERRING, D.P.C. |




490 \& GOLF
PROJECT\#: 20192073613
TOWN OF PITTSFORD COUNTY OF MONROE STATE OF NEW YORK

SITE DETAILS

| C.E. JOB NUMBER |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 7714.01 | CA503 |


[^0]:    SWORN STATEMENT: As applicant or legal agent for the above described property, I do hereby swear that all statements, descriptions, and signatures appearing on this form and all accompanying materials are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

[^1]:    *Refer to attached sheet

