### APPROVED MINUTES 060925

### TOWN OF PITTSFORD PLANNING BOARD JUNE 9, 2025

Minutes of the Town of Pittsford Planning Board meeting held on June 9, 2025, at 6:30PM local time. The meeting took place in the Lower-Level Meeting Room of Pittsford Town Hall, 11 S. Main Street.

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

**ABSENT:** Kevin Morabito

ALSO PRESENT: April Zurowski, Planning Assistant; Robert Koegel, Town Attorney; Evan Harkin, Student

Member

**ATTENDANCE:** There were 17 members of the public present.

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

### **NEW APPLICATION:**

### Passero Associates, Pittsford Oaks Apartments

Final Site Plan

Vice Chairman Halldow stated that this application has been deemed incomplete and there is no public hearing on the matter. He invited the applicant to address the Board.

Anthony Daniele, of 2851 Clover LLC, stated that the Final Site Plan application will be re-submitted this week to the Town. He shared a grading plan, a landscaping plan, and a lighting plan for the Board to review. He stated that the stormwater ponds were reduced and replaced with an underground chamber. He stated that the lighting plan was updated, and additional lighting was added near the southern parking lot. The landscaping plan was updated as a result of the revised grading plan. Mr. Daniele asked the Board to identify a region where more landscaping may be needed. He stated that the landscape cost estimate will be revised to include more plantings to meet the code requirement laid out in the Preliminary Site Plan approval. Ms. Zurowski identified the northeast corner as an area where landscaping was spaced out after the northern stormwater pond was removed. Mr. Daniele suggested additional trees and plantings along Tobey Village Road.

Board Member Liebschutz asked which types of trees are proposed in the northeast corner. Mr. Daniele stated that the trees in that area are proposed for oak and crabapples. Board Member Liebschutz asked if any pollinator plants were proposed. Ms. Zurowski stated that the Environmental Board will suggest this and will complete a comprehensive review of the updated landscaping plan.

Mr. Daniele showed the latest elevations for the apartment building. He stated that the Design Review and Historic Preservation Board will review these at their meeting on Thursday. A larger section of the third floor at the northeast corner was reduced per the DRHPB's comments in September. Due to this reduction, the unit count has been reduced to 169. This also allowed the dead-end aisles to be removed in the underground parking area. This will all be shown in the anticipated new submission.

### **APPROVED MINUTES 060925**

## Cinnaholic Gourmet Cinnamon Rolls, 3349 Monroe Avenue (Pittsford Plaza) Special Use Permit

Kiran Kaur, owner of Cinnaholic, introduced the application. She stated that this is the first Cinnaholic franchise in New York State. There are over 100 locations in the United States.

Vice Chairman Halldow motioned to open the public hearing, seconded by Board Member Jefferson; all ayes, none opposed. Vice Chairman Halldow asked for public comment. Hearing none, Vice Chairman Halldow motioned to close the public hearing, seconded by Board Member Liebschutz; all ayes, none opposed.

Vice Chairman Halldow read the Preliminary/Final Site Plan resolution, which was unanimously approved.

## Adelita's Mexican Cocina & Tequila – Outdoor Seating, 3349 Monroe Avenue (Pittsford Plaza) Special Use Permit

Cesar Moreno, of Adelita's Mexican Cocina & Tequila, and Karl Postler, of Wilmorite Management Group LLC, introduced the application. Mr. Postler stated that existing landscaping around the building will be removed and a fenced-in outdoor seating area is proposed.

Board Member Alguire asked if any new lighting is proposed. Mr. Postler stated that there will be no new lighting.

Board Member Liebschutz was not in favor of removing the landscaping around the building. Mr. Postler stated that the landscaping will be relocated to the island across from the frontage of Adelita's.

Board Member Jefferson asked if any bollards are proposed, as the seating area is next to the drive lane. Mr. Postler stated that a fence is proposed, but no bollards.

Vice Chairman Halldow stated that he was not in favor of the plan to remove and relocate the existing landscaping. Board Member Limbeck agreed and suggested that Mr. Postler relocated the drive lane in order to keep the landscaping and create an outdoor seating area. Mr. Postler stated that the applicant will come up with an idea to present to the Board.

Board Member Limbeck motioned to open the public hearing, seconded by Board Member Buckley; all ayes, none opposed. Vice Chairman Halldow asked for public comment.

Brian Scudder, of 22 Evergreen Lane, asked the type of fence that is proposed. Mr. Postler stated that it will be a metal three-rail fence.

Vice Chairman Halldow stated that the public hearing will remain open at this time.

## Allendale Columbia School – Daycare Expansion, 519 Allens Creek Road Special Use Permit

Eric Steiner, of Allendale Columbia School, introduced the application. He stated that the internal daycare will be expanded from 10 toddlers to 32. The Department of Child and Family Services has already approved this request.

### APPROVED MINUTES 060925

Vice Chairman Halldow motioned to open the public hearing, seconded by Board Member Liebschutz; all ayes, none opposed. Vice Chairman Halldow asked for public comment. Hearing none, Vice Chairman Halldow motioned to close the public hearing, seconded by Board Member Limbeck; all ayes, none opposed.

Vice Chairman Halldow read the Preliminary/Final Site Plan resolution, which was unanimously approved.

### **OTHER DISCUSSION:**

The minutes of March 24, 2025, were approved following a motion by Board Member Alguire, seconded by Board Member Limbeck. Following a unanimous voice vote, the minutes were approved, none opposed.

Board Member Jefferson motioned to close the meeting at 7:17PM, seconded by Board Member Limbeck, and was approved by a unanimous voice vote, none opposed.

Respectfully submitted,

April Zurowski Planning Assistant

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

# TOWN OF PITTSFORD PLANNING BOARD SEQRA RESOLUTION Cinnaholics Special Use Permit 3349 Monroe Avenue (Pittsford Plaza) Tax Parcel #150.12-1-18

WHEREAS Cinnaholics Gourmet Cinnamon Rolls, as agent for Wilmorite Management Group LLC, has made application for Special Use Permit approval for the operation of a restaurant at 3349 Monroe Avenue (Pittsford Plaza), with application materials received April 30, 2025; and

WHEREAS this is an Unlisted Action pursuant to SEQRA and the Planning Board has conducted a single agency review; and

WHEREAS a Part I Short EAF was submitted by the applicant and the Planning Board has completed a Part II Short EAF, attached hereto; and

NOW, THEREFORE, upon careful and deliberate consideration by the Planning Board, of all written and oral submissions and testimony by the applicant, appropriate agencies, the public, and the Planning Board having given this matter due deliberation and consideration; it is

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board finds that the proposed action will not have any significant adverse impact on the environment, and accordingly, hereby grants a negative declaration pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act based upon the following Findings of Fact:

### FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. This application proposes operation of a restaurant, Cinnaholics Gourmet Cinnamon Rolls, within the existing main building at 3349 Monroe Avenue (Pittsford Plaza). The former tenant, The UPS Store, will be renovated to include an oven, refrigerators, a soft-serve ice cream machine, and associated workspace to serve the new tenant.
- 2. The Planning Board has considered possible environmental impacts associated with the application and completed a Short Part II EAF which did not identify significant impacts, attached hereto.
- 3. The applicant submitted responses to Town Code §185-174 Determination of Impact and the Planning Board has reviewed the applicant's responses to evaluate potential impacts to the plaza and Monroe Avenue corridor and the Board has concluded that the proposed restaurant will not adversely impact the neighborhood or district.

### CONCLUSION

The Planning Board finds that the proposed action will not have any significant adverse impact on the environment, and accordingly, hereby grants a negative declaration pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act.

The within Resolution was motioned by Planning Board Member Hali Buckley, seconded by Planning Board Member Paula Liebschutz, and voted upon by members of the Planning Board as follows:

Paul Alguire Aye
David Jefferson Aye
Paula Liebschutz Aye
Hali Buckley Aye
Kevin Morabito Absent
John Limbeck Aye
John Halldow Aye

Adopted by the Planning Board on June 9, 2025.

# 617.20 Appendix B Short Environmental Assessment Form

### **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					
Name of Action or Project:					
Cinnaholic					
Project Location (describe, and attach a location map):					
3349 Monroe Avenue Rochester, NY 14618 - Pittsford Plaza					
Brief Description of Proposed Action:					
Renovating space #5 (former UPS Store) at Pittsford Plaza to a Retail bakery - Cinnamo connections to existing MEP.	on rolls. I	New interior partitions, fini	ishes,	EQ, ligh	ting,
Name of Applicant or Sponsor:	Telepl	hone: (801) 742-5161			
Katherine Carey (Applicant)	E-Mai	il: kat.carey@tedrowdesi	ian.∞	m	
Address:		,,,			
2886 Adams Brook Way					
City/PO:		State:	Zip	Code:	
Snellville		GA	3007	8	
1. Does the proposed action only involve the legislative adoption of a plan, le	ocal law	v, ordinance,		NO	YES
administrative rule, or regulation?  If Yes, attach a narrative description of the intent of the proposed action and	the env	ironmental resources t	hat		
may be affected in the municipality and proceed to Part 2. If no, continue to			nat	✓	ш
2. Does the proposed action require a permit, approval or funding from any	other go	overnmental Agency?		NO	YES
If Yes, list agency(s) name and permit or approval: City of Pittsford - building permit and health permit					<b>√</b>
3.a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action?  b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed?  c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor?  0 acres					
4. Check all land uses that occur on, adjoining and near the proposed action.  ☐ Urban ☐ Rural (non-agriculture) ☐ Industrial ☐ Commo ☐ Forest ☐ Agriculture ☐ Aquatic ☐ Other (☐ ☐ Parkland	ercial	Residential (suburb	oan)		

5. Is the proposed action,	NO	YES	N/A
a. A permitted use under the zoning regulations?		<b>√</b>	
b. Consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan?		$\overline{\checkmark}$	
6. Is the proposed action consistent with the predominant character of the existing built or natural		NO	YES
landscape?			✓
7. Is the site of the proposed action located in, or does it adjoin, a state listed Critical Environmental Al If Yes, identify:	rea?	NO	YES
in res, identity.		$\checkmark$	$  \sqcup  $
8. a. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels?		NO	YES
		<b>✓</b>	Ш,
b. Are public transportation service(s) available at or near the site of the proposed action?			<u> </u>
c. Are any pedestrian accommodations or bicycle routes available on or near site of the proposed ac	tion?		abla
Does the proposed action meet or exceed the state energy code requirements?  If the proposed action will exceed requirements, describe design features and technologies:		NO	YES
If the proposed action will exceed requirements, describe design features and technologies.		$\checkmark$	$ \Box$
10. Will the proposed action connect to an existing public/private water supply?		NO	YES
If No, describe method for providing potable water:			<b>√</b>
11. Will the proposed action connect to existing wastewater utilities?		NO	YES
If No, describe method for providing wastewater treatment:			
12. a. Does the site contain a structure that is listed on either the State or National Register of Historic Places?		NO	YES
b. Is the proposed action located in an archeological sensitive area?		M	片
		<b>√</b>	VEC
13. a. Does any portion of the site of the proposed action, or lands adjoining the proposed action, contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency?	n	NO V	YES
b. Would the proposed action physically alter, or encroach into, any existing wetland or waterbody?	,		片
If Yes, identify the wetland or waterbody and extent of alterations in square feet or acres:		V	ш
14. Identify the typical habitat types that occur on, or are likely to be found on the project site. Check	all that	annlu	
Shoreline Forest Agricultural/grasslands Early mid-successi		appiy.	
☐ Wetland ☐ Urban ☐ Suburban			
15. Does the site of the proposed action contain any species of animal, or associated habitats, listed		NO	YES
by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered?		<b>√</b>	
16. Is the project site located in the 100 year flood plain?		NO	YES
		V	1
17. Will the proposed action create storm water discharge, either from point or non-point sources? If Yes,		NO	YES
a. Will storm water discharges flow to adjacent properties?		✓	$ oldsymbol{\sqcup} $
b. Will storm water discharges be directed to established conveyance systems (runoff and storm drain	as)?		
If Yes, briefly describe:	-		

18. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that result in the impoundment of	NO	YES
water or other liquids (e.g. retention pond, waste lagoon, dam)?  If Yes, explain purpose and size:	<b>✓</b>	
19. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the location of an active or closed	NO	YES
solid waste management facility?		
If Yes, describe:		
	•	_
20. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the subject of remediation (ongoing or	NO	YES
completed) for hazardous waste?		
If Yes, describe:		Ш
	-	_
I AFFIRM THAT THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE IS TRUE AND ACCURATE TO THE	DECT O	EMV
KNOWLEDGE	DESI U	r MIX
Applicant/sponsor name: Katherine Carey Date: 04/21/2	025	
Signature: Kathaim. Cary.		

### Short Environmental Assessment Form Part 2 - Impact Assessment

### Part 2 is to be completed by the Lead Agency.

Answer all of the following questions in Part 2 using the information contained in Part 1 and other materials submitted by the project sponsor or otherwise available to the reviewer. When answering the questions the reviewer should be guided by the concept "Have my responses been reasonable considering the scale and context of the proposed action?"

		No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
1.	Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?	<b>✓</b>	
2.	Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?	<b>✓</b>	
3.	Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?	<b>✓</b>	
4.	Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?	<b>✓</b>	
5.	Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?	<b>✓</b>	
6.	Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?	<b>✓</b>	

	7.	Will the proposed action impact existing: a. public / private water supplies?	<b>✓</b>			
		b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities?	<b>✓</b>			
	8.	Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?	<b>✓</b>			
	9.	Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?	<b>✓</b>			
	10.	Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?	<b>✓</b>			
	11.	Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?	<b>✓</b>			
]	partic comp have deter proba	every question in Part 2 that was answered "moderate to large impact may occur", or if there is cular element of the proposed action may or will not result in a significant adverse environment olete Part 3. Part 3 should, in sufficient detail, identify the impact, including any measures or debeen included by the project sponsor to avoid or reduce impacts. Part 3 should also explain homined that the impact may or will not be significant. Each potential impact should be assessed ability of occurring, duration, irreversibility, geographic scope and magnitude. Also consider the long-term and cumulative impacts.	al impact, j sign eleme w the lead considering	please nts that agency g its setting,		
	Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action may result in one or more potentially large or significant adverse impacts and an environmental impact statement is required.  Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.					
	-	Name of Lead Agency Date				
		Print or Type Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency  Title of Responsible Offi	icer			

Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency

Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer)

# TOWN OF PITTSFORD PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION Cinnaholics Special Use Permit 3349 Monroe Avenue (Pittsford Plaza) Tax Parcel #150.12-1-18

WHEREAS Cinnaholics Gourmet Cinnamon Rolls, as agent for Wilmorite Management Group LLC, has made application for Special Use Permit approval for the operation of a restaurant at 3349 Monroe Avenue (Pittsford Plaza), with application materials received April 30, 2025; and

WHEREAS this is an Unlisted Action pursuant to SEQRA and as the only involved agency the Planning Board conducted a single agency review and granted a negative declaration on June 9, 2025; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was duly advertised and held on June 9, 2025, and public comment was incorporated into the public record; and

NOW, THEREFORE, upon consideration by the Planning Board, of all written and oral submissions and testimony by the applicant, appropriate agencies, and the public, the Planning Board having given this matter due deliberation and consideration; it is

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Pittsford grants Special Use Permit approval based upon the following Findings of Fact and subject to compliance with the following Conditions of Approval:

### FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. This application proposes operation of a restaurant, Cinnaholics Gourmet Cinnamon Rolls, within the existing main building at 3349 Monroe Avenue (Pittsford Plaza). The former tenant, The UPS Store, will be renovated to include an oven, refrigerators, a soft-serve ice cream machine, and associated workspace to serve the new tenant.
- 2. The applicant submitted responses to Town Code §185-174 Determination of Impact and the Planning Board has reviewed the applicant's responses to evaluate potential impacts to the plaza and Monroe Avenue corridor and the Board has concluded that the proposed restaurant will not adversely impact the neighborhood or district.
- 3. Recent observations have shown that parking in the plaza is sufficient, but at peak times parking may only be available in less than convenient locations. The proposed use may generate increased parking generation that coincide with existing peak periods.

### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- 1. Subject to compliance with or resolution to the DRC comments dated June 2, 2025, and the applicant's written responses dated June 6, 2025, unless otherwise specified herein.
- 2. Subject to compliance with or resolution to the Monroe County DRC comments dated May 27, 2025, unless otherwise specified herein.
- 3. The Town Sewer Department must be contacted for sanitary sewer entrance fees. These fees will be due and collected prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 4. Grease trap design and details are subject to compliance with the Town Engineer's letter to the applicant dated May 28, 2025, prior to the issuance of a building permit.

- 5. Building and demolition permits are required from the Town of Pittsford Building Department prior to any demolition or renovation of the space. Maximum occupancy will be determined by the Fire Marshal.
- 6. Signage design is subject to review and approval by the Design Review and Historic Preservation Board.
- 7. Future proposed outside seating is subject to approval by the property owner and Department of Public Works. Any future plan should maintain adequate pedestrian travel across the front of the building.
- 8. Subject to applicable regulatory approvals including but not limited to: Monroe County Water Authority, Monroe County Department of Health, the Town Engineer, and Sewer Department.

The within Resolution was motioned by Planning Board Member Hali Buckley, seconded by Planning Board Member John Limbeck, and voted upon by members of the Planning Board as follows:

Paul Alguire Aye
David Jefferson Aye
Paula Liebschutz Aye
Hali Buckley Aye
Kevin Morabito Absent
John Limbeck Aye
John Halldow Aye

Adopted by the Planning Board on June 9, 2025.

# TOWN OF PITTSFORD PLANNING BOARD SEQRA RESOLUTION

# Allendale Daycare Expansion Special Use Permit 519 Allens Creek Road (Allendale Columbia School) Tax Parcel #137.20-2-5

WHEREAS Allendale Columbia School has made application for Special Use Permit approval for the expansion of existing daycare operations at 519 Allens Creek Road with application materials received April 30, 2025; and

WHEREAS this is an Unlisted Action pursuant to SEQRA and the Planning Board has conducted a single agency review; and

WHEREAS a Part I Short EAF was submitted by the applicant and the Planning Board has completed a Part II Short EAF, attached hereto; and

NOW, THEREFORE, upon careful and deliberate consideration by the Planning Board, of all written and oral submissions and testimony by the applicant, appropriate agencies, the public, and the Planning Board having given this matter due deliberation and consideration; it is

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board finds that the proposed action will not have any significant adverse impact on the environment, and accordingly, hereby grants a negative declaration pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act based upon the following Findings of Fact:

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

- This application proposes an operational expansion of the existing daycare facility located within the
  existing building at 519 Allens Creek Road, occupied by Allendale Columbia School. No external changes
  or expansions are proposed.
- 2. The Planning Board has considered possible environmental impacts associated with the application and completed a Short Part II EAF which did not identify significant impacts, attached hereto.
- 3. The applicant submitted responses to Town Code §185-174 Determination of Impact and the Planning Board has reviewed the applicant's responses to evaluate potential impacts to surrounding neighborhoods and Allens Creek Road and the Board has concluded that the proposed daycare expansion will not adversely impact the neighborhood or district.

### CONCLUSION

The Planning Board finds that the proposed action will not have any significant adverse impact on the environment, and accordingly, hereby grants a negative declaration pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act.

The within Resolution was motioned by Planning Board Member Hali Buckley, seconded by Planning Board Member John Limbeck, and voted upon by members of the Planning Board as follows:

Paul Alguire Aye
David Jefferson Aye
Paula Liebschutz Aye
Hali Buckley Aye
Kevin Morabito Absent
John Limbeck Aye
John Halldow Aye

Adopted by the Planning Board on June 9, 2025.

# 617.20 Appendix B Short Environmental Assessment Form

### 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					
AC Little School Expansion					
Name of Action or Project:					
AC Little School Expansion					
Project Location (describe, and attach a location map):					
519 Allens Creek Rd - Little School Building					
Brief Description of Proposed Action:					
Expanding attendance of our Little School to 32 toddlers and associated staff in accorda	ince with	our license from NYS OC	OFS.		
Name of Applicant or Sponsor:	Teleph	hone: (585) 381-4560			
Eric A. Steiner	E-Mai	il: esteiner@allendalecol	lumbia.	.org	
Address:					
519 Allens Creek Rd					
City/PO:		State:	Zip	Code:	
Rochester		NY	14618	8	
1. Does the proposed action only involve the legislative adoption of a plan, le	ocal law	v, ordinance,		NO	YES
administrative rule, or regulation?  If Yes, attach a narrative description of the intent of the proposed action and may be affected in the municipality and proceed to Part 2. If no, continue to			hat	<b>√</b>	
2. Does the proposed action require a permit, approval or funding from any	other go	overnmental Agency?		NO	YES
If Yes, list agency(s) name and permit or approval:				<b>√</b>	
3.a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action?  b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed?  c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor?  30 acres  0 acres					
4. Check all land uses that occur on, adjoining and near the proposed action.  ☐ Urban ☐ Rural (non-agriculture) ☐ Industrial ☐ Commo ☐ Forest ☐ Agriculture ☐ Aquatic ☐ Other (some of the common of	ercial	Residential (suburb	oan)		

5. Is the proposed action,	NO	YES	N/A
a. A permitted use under the zoning regulations?		$\checkmark$	
b. Consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan?		<b>√</b>	
6. Is the proposed action consistent with the predominant character of the existing built or natural		NO	YES
landscape?			✓
7. Is the site of the proposed action located in, or does it adjoin, a state listed Critical Environmental Ar	rea?	NO	YES
If Yes, identify:		$\overline{}$	
a. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels?	_	NO	YES
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		<b>√</b>	
b. Are public transportation service(s) available at or near the site of the proposed action?		<b>√</b>	
c. Are any pedestrian accommodations or bicycle routes available on or near site of the proposed ac	tion?	<b>√</b>	
Does the proposed action meet or exceed the state energy code requirements?		NO	YES
If the proposed action will exceed requirements, describe design features and technologies:			$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$
10. Will the proposed action connect to an existing public/private water supply?		NO	YES
If No, describe method for providing potable water:		<b>V</b>	
		•	
11. Will the proposed action connect to existing wastewater utilities?		NO	YES
If No, describe method for providing wastewater treatment:			<b>7</b>
		ш	<b>V</b>
12. a. Does the site contain a structure that is listed on either the State or National Register of Historic		NO	YES
Places?		✓	
b. Is the proposed action located in an archeological sensitive area?		<b>V</b>	
13. a. Does any portion of the site of the proposed action, or lands adjoining the proposed action, contain	n	NO	YES
wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency?			V
b. Would the proposed action physically alter, or encroach into, any existing wetland or waterbody? If Yes, identify the wetland or waterbody and extent of alterations in square feet or acres:		✓	
Allens Creek nearby			
14. Identify the typical habitat types that occur on, or are likely to be found on the project site. Check a		apply:	
☐ Shoreline ☐ Forest ☐ Agricultural/grasslands ☐ Early mid-successi	onal		
□ Wetland □ Urban ☑ Suburban    Suburban □ Urban ☑ Suburban □ Urban □ Ur		NO	VEC
15. Does the site of the proposed action contain any species of animal, or associated habitats, listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered?		NO	YES
		V	L TOPO
16. Is the project site located in the 100 year flood plain?		NO	YES
17. Will the proposed action create storm water discharge, either from point or non-point sources?		NO	YES
If Yes,		<b>V</b>	
a. Will storm water discharges flow to adjacent properties?		L¥	
b. Will storm water discharges be directed to established conveyance systems (runoff and storm drain	ıs)?		
If Yes, briefly describe:			

18. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that result in the impoundment of	NO	YES
water or other liquids (e.g. retention pond, waste lagoon, dam)?		
If Yes, explain purpose and size:		
	✔	ш
		_
10. Use the gite of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the location of an active or closed	NO	YES
19. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the location of an active or closed	110	1123
solid waste management facility?		
If Yes, describe:		
	ا تا ا	ш
20. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the subject of remediation (ongoing or	NO	YES
completed) for hazardous waste?		
If Yes, describe:		
11 1 60, 46661106.		ш
I AFFIRM THAT THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE IS TRUE AND ACCURATE TO THE I	BEST O	FMY
KNOWLEDGE		
Applicant/sponsor name: Eric A. Steiner Date: 03/18/20	025	
Signature:		

### Short Environmental Assessment Form Part 2 - Impact Assessment

### Part 2 is to be completed by the Lead Agency.

Answer all of the following questions in Part 2 using the information contained in Part 1 and other materials submitted by the project sponsor or otherwise available to the reviewer. When answering the questions the reviewer should be guided by the concept "Have my responses been reasonable considering the scale and context of the proposed action?"

		No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
1.	Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?	<b>✓</b>	
2.	Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?	<b>✓</b>	
3.	Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?	<b>✓</b>	
4.	Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?	<b>✓</b>	
5.	Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?	<b>✓</b>	
6.	Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?	<b>✓</b>	

7.	Will the proposed action impact existing:  a. public / private water supplies?	<b>✓</b>			
	b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities?	<b>✓</b>			
8.	Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?	<b>✓</b>			
9.	Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?	<b>✓</b>			
10	0. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?	<b>✓</b>			
1	1. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?	<b>√</b>			
Part 3 Determination of Significance  For every question in Part 2 that was answered "moderate to large impact may occur", or if there is a need to explain why particular element of the proposed action may or will not result in a significant adverse environmental impact, please complete Part 3. Part 3 should, in sufficient detail, identify the impact, including any measures or design elements that have been included by the project sponsor to avoid or reduce impacts. Part 3 should also explain how the lead agency determined that the impact may or will not be significant. Each potential impact should be assessed considering its setting probability of occurring, duration, irreversibility, geographic scope and magnitude. Also consider the potential for short-term, long-term and cumulative impacts.					
Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action may result in one or more potentially large or significant adverse impacts and an environmental impact statement is required.  Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.					
	Name of Lead Agency Date				
	Print or Type Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency  Title of Responsible Offi	icer			

Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency

Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer)

# TOWN OF PITTSFORD PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION

# Allendale Daycare Expansion Special Use Permit 519 Allens Creek Road (Allendale Columbia School) Tax Parcel #137.20-2-5

WHEREAS Allendale Columbia School has made application for Special Use Permit approval for the expansion of existing daycare operations at 519 Allens Creek Road with application materials received April 30, 2025; and

WHEREAS this is an Unlisted Action pursuant to SEQRA and as the only involved agency the Planning Board conducted a single agency review and granted a negative declaration on June 9, 2025; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was duly advertised and held on June 9, 2025, and public comment was incorporated into the public record; and

NOW, THEREFORE, upon consideration by the Planning Board, of all written and oral submissions and testimony by the applicant, appropriate agencies, and the public, the Planning Board having given this matter due deliberation and consideration; it is

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board of the Town of Pittsford grants Special Use Permit approval based upon the following Findings of Fact and subject to compliance with the following Conditions of Approval:

### FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. This application proposes an operational expansion of the existing daycare facility located within the existing building at 519 Allens Creek Road, occupied by Allendale Columbia School. No external changes or expansions are proposed.
- 2. The applicant submitted responses to Town Code §185-174 Determination of Impact and the Planning Board has reviewed the applicant's responses to evaluate potential impacts to surrounding neighborhoods and Allens Creek Road and the Board has concluded that the proposed expansion of the daycare use will not adversely impact the neighborhood or district.
- 3. There have been no recently recorded complaints from the adjacent property owners regarding increased traffic due to the daycare. It is possible that at peak pick-up and drop-off times, minor backups could occur.

### **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

- 1. Subject to compliance with or resolution to the DRC comments dated June 6, 2025, and the applicant's written responses dated June 6, 2025, unless otherwise specified herein.
- 2. Subject to compliance with or resolution to the Monroe County DRC comments May 27, 2025, unless otherwise specified herein.
- 3. This approval is for up to 32 toddlers at the Little School daycare facility within Allendale Columbia School. Any future expansion of the daycare operations will require submission of a Special Use Permit amendment application to the Planning Board.
- 4. An inspection of the space must be conducted annually by the Town of Pittsford Fire Marshal for code compliance. Inspection reports from the New York State Education Department should be delivered to the Town as they occur.

- 5. The daycare must continue to obtain an up-to-date license from the New York State Office of Children and Family Services and must comply with all applicable New York State, Monroe County, and Town of Pittsford requirements.
- 6. In the event that unreasonable traffic impacts occur on Allens Creek Road, the school may be required to stagger daycare drop-off and pick-up times at the request of the Department of Public Works.

The within Resolution was motioned by Planning Board Member Paula Liebschutz, seconded by Planning Board Member John Limbeck, and voted upon by members of the Planning Board as follows:

Paul Alguire Aye
David Jefferson Aye
Paula Liebschutz Aye
Hali Buckley Aye
Kevin Morabito Absent
John Limbeck Aye
John Halldow Aye

Adopted by the Planning Board on June 9, 2025.