ZONING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

APRIL 21, 2016
Penfield Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes

The Zoning Board meeting at 6:30 PM local time Thursday, April 21, 2016, in the Auditorium Conference Room to discuss, in a meeting open to the public, tabled matters and other business that may be before it.

I. CALL TO THE ORDER

Meeting started at 6:32 p.m.
Regarding Minutes from Zoning Board Meeting on March 17, 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZBA MEMBER</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel DeLaus, Chairperson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Grussenmeyer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Mulcahy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Belgiorno</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andris Silins</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONAL STAFF</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Weishaar, Legal Counsel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Morehouse, Building and Zoning Administrator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine Shaw, Secretary to the Board</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>MOTION BY</th>
<th>SECOND</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>COMMENTS/ OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeLaus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td>Approve the March 17, 2016 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgiorno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grussenmeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulcahy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. PUBLIC HEARING:

The Chairperson briefly explained the procedures that the Zoning Board would follow during the public hearing, also guidelines to applicants and those members of the audience wishing to speak at the public hearing.

The Chairperson further went on to inform the audience that the Board may deliberate on the applications following the hearing and/or at a future work session. Those applicants and interested persons who wished to stay for the remaining portion of the meeting to listen to any deliberation on each matter are then welcome to do so.

The Clerk was directed to read the agenda.

NOTE: The following is meant to outline the major topics for discussion during the Zoning Board public hearings. For more detailed information, the reader should review the formal resolution for each application and ask to view the recorded video of the March 17, 2016 Zoning Board of Appeals public hearing, which is available at the Penfield Town Hall, 3100 Atlantic Avenue, Penfield, New York 14526 during regular business hours.

Public Hearing applications:

1. Kathleen & Michael Banks, 163 Bunker Hill Drive, Rochester, NY 14625 requests an Area Variance from Chapter 250 Article VII-7.1-D of the Code to allow a fence taller than 3 feet less than twenty (20) feet from the Right-of-Way of Holley Ridge Circle at 163 Bunker Hill Drive. The property is owned by Kathleen & Michael Banks and zoned R-1-20. SBL # 108.20-2-10. Application #16Z-0018.

Appearances by: Michael and Kathleen Banks, 163 Bunker Hill Drive, Rochester, NY 14625

Presenter’s statements: Michael Banks

- Requesting to put up a six foot pressure treated wooden fence within twenty feet of the right of way of Holly Ridge Circle.
- Intent is to replace and repair what is already there.
- Currently there is a six foot privacy fence that runs across rear of property and small section goes across the right of way, then another section of privacy fence is screwed to trees and has a large gate in it.
- There is another wire fence that is nailed to the pine trees and they will take that down also. This is in the south east corner.
- Mr. Banks does not think the repair of the fencing will impede anything from the driveway behind the property.
- The intention is to bring the fence in from the road making it four to six feet closer to the house, depending on what part you are looking at.
- If he brings the fence all the way in from the right of way, that part of the yard would be useless.
Parts of the fence are held up by green garden stakes as the posts are rotting out.

Board comments:
- Board Member Mulcahy - asked about the length and type of construction, color and if sight would be impeded for drivers going around the corner of Holly Ridge. Ms. Mulcahy asked why the Town code of a three foot fence wouldn’t be sufficient and if he could use shrubs.
- Mr. Banks - Length is 95-96 feet and Pressure treated wood, and is unstained at this time, he will stain it next year. There is no visibility issue for Bunker Hill and Holly Ridge automobiles as it is about 120 feet from where the fence ends versus where the lot ends. Their house sits up higher than the rest of the lot and a 3 foot fence would not give them any privacy nor keep their children (ages four and six) or large dog safely inside the property boundaries.
- Board Member Silins – mentions that the variance is actually being shortened because Mr. Banks is bringing the fence in four or five feet from the right of way.
- Board Member Grussenmeyer – Clarified that the good side of the fence would be constructed to face the neighbors. Mr. Grussenmeyer pointed out that the front yard is really the back side yard and that he is enclosing the back yard to the corner of the front yard and that the fence is about 125 feet away from the corner of the two roads.
- Chairperson DeLaus – asked if Mr. Banks watched last months’ meeting regarding the applicant for a variance for a fence which was denied and asked why Mr. Banks application is different from the previous requestors. Mr. Banks - His application is for the rear and side yard and that our code allows for a higher fence for that; he is not putting up a fence near the road in the front yard. He is enclosing the yard for the children and dog, not just for aesthetics. Mrs. Banks mentions that they will be removing the various kind of fencing that has been in place to make it all look the same. The other neighbors mentioned there was a six foot privacy fence all around, but it fell down and owners just put up various kinds of fencing just to get the yard enclosed.

Chairperson DeLaus - asked Harold if there was a variance requested in the past for this property for fencing.
Mr. Morehouse – answered, ‘none that he knew of’, and asked if Mr. Banks spoke with Andy Suveges regarding a pre-existing non-conforming use.
Mr. Banks – While looking on the survey map he saw there is Liber # 992 with the county. He researched and found that there was an agreement between the home owner & the ‘Nynes’ behind them at the time and they thought the fence that was put up properly and not in a right of way at that time.

Special conditions required by the Board:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>MOTION BY</th>
<th>SECOND</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>COMMENTS/ OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeLaus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgiorno</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grussenmeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulcahy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td>Type II Unlisted-no further action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>MOTION BY</th>
<th>SECOND</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>COMMENTS/ OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeLaus</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Nay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgiorno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grussenmeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulcahy</td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td>Denied / undesirable change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no other Six foot fences in the entire area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is a corner lot that should have 50’ side set back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and 40’ front set back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The resident could put in trees or shrubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is a 100 % variance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Mulcahy thinks the look of the additional fencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>would have adverse effect and that some of the areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the fence could just be repaired or leave it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The residents could put up a three foot fence where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the ‘wire’ is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The six year old child should/will learn not to go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>into the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previous fence applications have been denied for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>six foot height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion to deny the request to allow a 6 foot fence within 20 feet of a Right of Way did not carry.
Motion to approve the request to allow a 6 foot fence within 20 feet of a Right of Way was carried.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>MOTION BY</th>
<th>SECOND</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>COMMENTS/ OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeLaus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td>Does not think it is an undesirable change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgiorno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td>Usually the denial is for visual reasons &amp; as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>they are moving the fence in which makes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it less of a variance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He could see into the back window when he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>went to see the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grussenmeyer</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td>Mentions that the 6 foot fence that is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>already there can stay there and that the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>homeowner will be taking out the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>three fences that are in disrepair and make</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it all the same and further back behind the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>trees, so it’s an improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulcahy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. James Vordonis, 10 Folkestone Lane, Penfield, NY 14526 requests an Area Variance from Chapter 250 Article V-5.1-F-1 of the Code to allow an existing pool deck with less side setback at 10 Folkestone Lane. The property is owned by Robin & James Vordonis and zoned R-1-20. SBL # 125.03-1-2.122. Application #16Z-0016

APPLICATION ADJOURNED
3. Jeff Bell-Morgan Management, LLC, 1080 Pittsford Victor Road, Pittsford, NY 14534 requests a Special Permit for Signage under Chapter 250 Article X-10.3, Chapter 250 Article X-10.12-B and Chapter 250 Article X-10.12-C of the Code to allow more than one (1) freestanding sign with greater sign area at 2250 Penfield Road/351 Penbrooke Drive. The property is owned by Hidden Creek, LLC and zoned MR. SBL #140.01-1-10. Application #16Z-0017.

Appearances by: Jeff Bell-Morgan Management, LLC, 1080 Pittsford Victor Road, Pittsford, NY 14534

Presenter’s statements:
Jeff Bell
- Replace and update existing property sign in front of Leasing office
- Add single sided sign on both ends of the complex
- Want visibility clear for anyone driving through to be able to find what they are looking for.

Resident comments:
Margaret (no last name given)
- Margaret asked where exactly the signs are going, and if the signs would be lit up as her concern was for too many signs being placed on the property and if the Private Property could be ‘merged’ onto it.
- Mr. Bell said there will be no illumination of the signs.
- Margaret is not opposed to the new signs, just doesn’t want ‘many’ signs all over.

Michael Wright
- Mr. Wright lives at the complex and is in favor of signs. Has no concern for size and is ok with the proposal.

Board Comments
Board Member Silins – How did you determine the size? Will the sandwich signs be removed? There are No Trespassing & No Soliciting signs-are they part of this request. Mr. Silins inquired as to the color schemes and if Mr. Bell would be willing to resize the sign request.
Jeff Bell – Size was determined for visibility purposes. They will be removing sandwich signs. The No Trespassing and No Soliciting Signs are not part of the request, but if removing or keeping them is a deal breaker, the apartment complex will comply with ruling. The signs and endcaps are white, the sign will be white with blue trim. He is willing to make all the signs the same size as the one in front of the Leasing office – 61 x 42 inches wide.
Board Member Belgiono – asked if the complex could take ‘Penbrooke Meadows’ off the Leasing office sign because it would be considered a Directional sign and would not need a Variance.
Mr. Bell - would like to keep the signs consistent.
Board Member Silins - asked what was across the street and if there is any confusion as to if people confused the two properties.
Mr. Bell – Privately owned Townhomes are across the street and people do not confuse the two complexes as they look entirely different.
Board Member Grussenmeyer – Asked if there was any other signage on either Penfield Road or Route 250 to direct people to them. Mr. Grussenmeyer mentions that there are two different addresses on the application and he can see why people get confused trying to find them.
Mr. Bell – No, there are no signs on the main roads.
Harold Morehouse - There was a sign at Penbrooke Drive and Penfield Road in the median, but was taken down when the Penfield Road/Route 441 was reconstructed and widened. Board Member Mulcahy – If the Leasing Center is the main focus for the sign why is the lettering so small?
Mr. Bell – It is just the way the company drafted up the sample.
Chairman DeLaus- What is the distance between proposed sign on Route 250 side and the Leasing Sign?
Board Member Andris – 700 to 1000 feet.
Chairman DeLaus – How long have you been the manager at the complex and how do people hear of the complex?
Mr. Bell – Morgan Management for nine years but just took on this project of the apartment complex a few months ago. Most advertising is done through multiple companies on line. Ninety percent through the internet, but they do get foot traffic.

Special conditions required by the Board: 8.5 square feet or less – all signs will be the same size and sandwich boards will be removed, The No Trespassing and No Soliciting signs can stay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>MOTION BY</th>
<th>SECOND</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>COMMENTS/ OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeLaus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgiorno</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grussenmeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulcahy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silins</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td>Unlisted action negative declaration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>MOTION BY</th>
<th>SECOND</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>COMMENTS/ OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeLaus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgiorno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grussenmeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulcahy</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silins</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Louis Gitsis-Odyssey Inns, Inc., 1750 Empire Blvd, Webster, NY 14580 requests a Conditional Use Permit under Chapter 250 Article XIII-13.3 and Chapter 250 Article V-5.7-C-1 to allow an expansion to an existing conditionally permitted use and an Area Variance under Chapter 250 Article V-5.7-D-3 of the Code to allow the construction of a deck/patio at 1750 Empire Blvd. The property is owned by 1750 Route 404 LLC and zoned GB. SBL # 093.15-1-52. Application #16Z-0015

Appearances by: Louis Gitsis-Odyssey Inns, Inc., 1750 Empire Blvd, Webster, NY 14580

Presenter’s statements:
Louis Gitsis
- This hotel was previously called The Denonville Inn and the Outlook Motel.
- Requesting conditional use permit to make upgrades and changes to the motel over the next several years.
- Long term plan to include: a deck, remodeling the lobby, reception area, gathering area, and the restaurant.
- They have been trying to create a better atmosphere, slowly remodeling the hotel room by room, by putting in hardwood floors a lot of rooms, and put new boilers in.
- Mr. Gitsis thinks this will be a five stage project, first to start with getting rid of the in-ground pool and has taken out a demolition permit to start that process.
- The next would be to remodel the reception area and restaurant, then the parking lot.
- He had a rendering from Home Depot of the patio/deck they wanted built, but Mr. Gitsis said the contractor, Exceleron rejected it saying it wouldn’t work as handicap access is needed on the property.
- Mr. Gitsis would like an ok from the board today for just the size of the deck of 24 x 20 foot size and 16 to 32 inches high depending on how the access ramp needs to be built in. He will come back with the plans, as far as type of construction, and materials.
- Mr. Gitsis needs to build a door from the bar and reception area to where the deck will go before he can put the deck up. The door will be a 72 inch door – 36 inch wide with two side lights. They are going to build temporary stairs there and use it for an emergency door until they get approval for the deck. The bar only has one exit and needs another exit for safety. They also intend to change accessibility from the other doors that are on the property to make them handicap accessible.

Board Comments
Board Member Belgiorno - mentions that we cannot approve a deck we cannot yet see. Mr. Gitsis wants the board to approve a concept. If they have to build a door first, what height will it be cut at? How are you going to cut the door if you don’t know what the height of the deck will be?
Mr. Gitsis – answered the door would be cut at 32 inches – the floor of the inside. As he is changing the exterior of the building is the reason he needs the variance and if we don’t approve a deck he can’t have the door (though he will still have a temporary staircase up).
Chairman DeLaus - says we can’t approve a variance as we don’t have enough information.
Board Member Belgiorno - mentions that approval would be inefficient for Mr. Gitsis as changes may need to be made three different ways and he would have to come back a second time.
Mr. Gitsis - says the contractor is set on the size of the deck but just has to figure out the design of the handicap ramp.
Board Member Belgiorno - says he has to have that figured out prior to approval
Board Member Grussenmeyer - says to ask the contractor to figure out how the slope will go. The Board needs to know the construction, what will the railings look like and construction of them, what is the deck made out of, where is the door, where is the emergency exit.
Chairman DeLaus - mentions that the Board is always wanting to help the businesses.

APPLICATION TABLED

Special conditions required by the Board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>MOTION BY</th>
<th>SECOND</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>COMMENTS/ OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeLaus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgiorno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grussenmeyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulcahy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>MOTION BY</th>
<th>SECOND</th>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>COMMENTS/ OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeLaus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgiorno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grussenmeyer</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulcahy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There being no further business to come before the Board, this meeting was adjourned 8:16 p.m. on Thursday, April 21, 2016.

These minutes were adopted by the Zoning Board of Appeals on May 17, 2016.
Kathleen & Michael Banks, 163 Bunker Hill Drive, Rochester, NY 14625 requests an Area Variance from Chapter 250 Article VII-7.1-D of the Code to allow a fence taller than 3 feet less than twenty (20) feet from the Right-of-Way of Holley Ridge Circle at 163 Bunker Hill Drive. The property is owned by Kathleen & Michael Banks and zoned R-1-20. SBL # 108.20-2-10. Application #16Z-0018.

WHEREAS, an application has been received by the Penfield Zoning Board of Appeals requesting an Area Variance from Chapter 250 Article VII-7.1-D of the Code of the Town of Penfield to allow an existing patio with less setback at 163 Bunker Hill Drive; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Appeals of said Town of Penfield held a public hearing at the Penfield Town Hall, 3100 Atlantic Avenue, Penfield, New York on April 21, 2016 at 7:00 PM to consider the said application and hear all persons in favor of or opposed to the application; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Appeals, acting as lead agency pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) has classified this application as a Type II action, requiring no further review under SEQRA. Therefore, the submission of a draft Environmental Impact Statement will not be required.

Motion to classify this application as a Type II action and no further environmental review will be required.

Moved: Carole Mulcahy
Seconded: Michael Belgiorno

Vote of the Board

Daniel DeLaus  AYE
Michael Belgiorno  AYE
Joseph Grussenmeyer  AYE
Carole Mulcahy  AYE
Andris Silins  AYE
AREA VARIANCE TO ALLOW A FENCE TALLER THAN 3 FEET LESS THAN TWENTY (20) FEET FROM THE RIGHT-OF-WAY.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board hereby APPROVES the application for an area variance of three (3) feet from the allowed three (3) foot fence height resulting in a six (6) foot tall fence within twenty (20) feet of the right of way of Holley Ridge Circle at 163 Bunker Hill Drive; subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall construct the fence with the most pleasant or decorative side facing the adjacent properties.

2. The applicant shall be required to remove all fencing from the right of way of Holley Ridge Circle and restore the right of way to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.

3. The applicant shall be required to comply with requirements of the Property Maintenance Code of New York State and Chapter 250 Article VII-7.11 of the Code of the Town of Penfield.

The Board considered the following five (5) standards in applying the balancing test, which weighs the benefit to the applicant to the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community and bases its decision on the following findings as to each of the five (5) standards:

1. Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood, or a detriment to nearby properties will be created, by the granting of the area variance.

The Board determined that an undesirable change would not be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties by the granting of the requested area variance. The applicant has represented to the Board that the subject property has an existing fence constructed of various materials and the proposed fence would be constructed of one (1) fence system, which would more aesthetically pleasing for the neighborhood.

2. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some other method feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance.

The Board determined that the benefit sought by the applicant could not be achieved by some other method other than an area variance. The applicant has represented to the Board that they desire to provide as large a rear yard area as possible for the recreational enjoyment of the family.

3. Whether the requested area variance is substantial.
The Board determined that the requested area variance was not substantial. The applicant has represented to the Board that the existing fencing materials would be removed and the new fence would be placed further onto the subject property increasing the distance from the right of way of Holley Ridge Circle.

4. Whether the proposed area variance will have an adverse effect or impact on physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.

The Board determined that the proposed area variance would not have an adverse impact on the environmental conditions in the neighborhood. The Board addressed the impact the proposed fence would have to clear sight distance at the intersection of Bunker Hill Drive and Holley Ridge Circle and determined the proposed fence would not impact the intersect. The fence would be approximately one hundred forty (140) feet from the intersection.

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created.

The Board determined that the alleged difficulty was self-created. The applicant had recently purchased the subject property and desired to replace the existing dilapidated fence.

The Board is directed by statutory requirements to grant the minimum variance necessary. The approved setback shall not be modified at any time in the future without approval from the Board.

The Board’s decision was based upon the following information:

1. An Area Variance application form stamped received March 18, 2016 by the Building and Zoning Office.

2. A letter of intent dated March 16, 2016 stamped received March 18, 2016 by the Building and Zoning Office.

3. A Short Environmental Assessment Form dated March 16, 2016 stamped received March 18, 2016 by the Building and Zoning Office.

5. An aerial photograph of the subject property.

6. A drawing of the proposed fence provided by the applicant at the public hearing.

7. Testimony provided by the applicant and interested parties at the public hearing.

Moved to approve the application for area variance to allow a fence taller than three (3) feet less than twenty (20) feet from the right of way:

   Michael Belgiorno

Seconded: Joseph Grussenmeyer

Vote of the Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel DeLaus</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Belgiorno</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Grussenmeyer</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Mulcahy</td>
<td>NAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andris Silins</td>
<td>AYE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion to approve the foregoing portion of the application was carried.
PENFIELD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
April 21, 2016

Jeff Bell-Morgan Management, LLC, 1080 Pittsford Victor Road, Pittsford, NY 14534 requests a Special Permit for Signage under Chapter 250 Article X-10.3, Chapter 250 Article X-10.12-B and Chapter 250 Article X-10.12-C of the Code to allow more than one (1) freestanding sign with greater sign area at 2250 Penfield Road/351 Penbrooke Drive. The property is owned by Hidden Creek, LLC and zoned MR. SBL #140.01-1-10. Application #16Z-0017.

WHEREAS, an application has been received by the Penfield Zoning Board of Appeals requesting a Special Permit for Signage under Chapter 250 Article X-10.3, Chapter 250 Article X-10.12-B and Chapter 250 Article X-10.12-C of the Code to allow more than one (1) freestanding sign with greater sign area at 2250 Penfield Road/351 Penbrooke Drive; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Appeals of said Town of Penfield held a public hearing at the Penfield Town Hall, 3100 Atlantic Avenue, Penfield, New York on April 21, 2016 at 7:00 PM to consider the said application and hear all persons in favor of or opposed to the application; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Appeals, acting as lead agency pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) has classified this proposal as an unlisted action. Furthermore, the Zoning Board of Appeals has determined that this proposal will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore, the submission of a draft Environmental Impact Statement will not be required.

Motion to classify this application as an unlisted action and issue a negative declaration, requiring no further environmental review.

Moved: Andris Silins
Seconded: Michael Belgiorno

Vote of the Board

Daniel DeLaus AYE
Michael Belgiorno AYE
Joseph Grussenmeyer AYE
Carole Mulcahy AYE
Andris Silins AYE
SPECIAL PERMIT FOR SIGNAGE TO ALLOW MORE THAN ONE (1) FREESTANDING SIGN WITH GREATER SIGN AREA

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board hereby APPROVES the application for a Special Permit for Signage to allow two (2) single faced 29 inch by 42 inch freestanding signs and one (1) double faced 29 inch by 42 inch freestanding sign at 2250 Penfield Road (Penbrooke Meadows apartments), subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall be permitted to construct one (1) single faced 29 inch by 42 inch freestanding sign on the subject property at the intersection of Penbrooke Drive and Bramblewood Lane, one (1) single faced 29 inch by 42 inch freestanding sign on the subject property at the intersection of Penbrooke Drive and Mapleview Circle and one (1) double faced 29 inch by 42 inch freestanding sign at the leasing center at 351 Penbrooke Drive.

2. The applicant shall not be permitted to illuminate the approved freestanding signs.

3. The applicant shall be permitted to construct the approved signs on the building side of the sidewalks and not interfere with the winter maintenance of the sidewalks.

4. The applicant shall be required to obtain a sign permit from the Building and Zoning office and pay the appropriate fee.

5. The applicant shall be permitted to place signage to not allow solicitors on the subject property.

6. The applicant shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Building Code of New York State, the Property Maintenance Code of New York State and Chapter 250 Article VII-7.11 of the Town Code.

7. The applicant shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Building and Zoning Administrator.

8. The applicant has agreed with the Board request to relinquish the current rights to a portable temporary freestanding sign.

The Board considered the following five (5) standards in applying the balancing test, which weighs the benefit to the applicant to the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community and bases its decision on the following findings as to each of the five (5) standards:

1. The proposed sign is in harmony with the standards for permitted signs and within the spirit of Article X.
The Board determined that the proposed signage is in harmony with the standards for permitted signs. The applicant has agreed to reduce the size of the two (2) single faced freestanding sign to be of a similar size as the double faced freestanding sign. All three (3) approved freestanding signs are smaller than the twenty (20) square foot freestanding signs that would be permitted under the Code.

2. The proposed sign shall be compatible and not detrimental to neighborhood properties.

The Board determined that the proposed signs are compatible and are not detrimental to neighborhood properties. The Board heard testimony from residents of the neighborhood that the proposed freestanding signs would not be detrimental to neighborhood properties provided the signage would not be illuminated.

3. The proposed sign does not; by reason of its location create a hazard of any nature to the public in general or to any owner or occupant of neighborhood properties.

The Board determined that the location of the proposed signs would not create a hazard to the public in general or to any owner or occupant of neighboring properties. The Board has required that the approved freestanding signs be constructed between the sidewalk and the buildings and not interfere with maintenance of the sidewalks.

4. The proposed sign does not in any way interfere with the lawful and aesthetic enjoyment of the public highway or neighborhood properties.

The Board determined that the location of the proposed signs does not in any way interfere with the lawful and aesthetic enjoyment of the public highway or neighborhood properties. The approved freestanding signs will be constructed on the property away from the existing roadway.

5. The proposed sign is necessary to enhance the business identification, because of the location of the business’ proximity to the front property line, the exterior appearance of the structure containing the business and the nature of the business.

The Board determined that the signage was necessary to identify the subject property. The applicant has represented to the Board that they have an interest to identify the subject property at the two (2) corners so deliveries and visitors of the apartment resident’s will know they have arrived at the property and to provide business identification for the leasing office. The applicant has represented that although many forms of advertisement is utilized, many prospective residents do drive around neighborhoods to search for housing.
The Board’s decision was based upon the following information:

1. A Special Permit for Signage application form stamped received March 18, 2016 by the Building and Zoning Office.

2. A letter of intent dated March 17, 2016 stamped received March 18, 2016 by the Building and Zoning Office.

3. An instrument survey prepared by Thomas Road, LS dated July 17, 2015 stamped received March 18, 2016 by the Building and Zoning Office.

4. A Short Environmental Assessment Form dated March 17, 2016 stamped received March 18, 2016 by the Building and Zoning Office.

5. Sign drawings prepared by Signs Now stamped received March 18, 2016 by the Building and Zoning Office.

6. Testimony provided by the applicant and interested parties at the public hearing.

Moved to approve the application for a Special Permit for Signage to allow more than one (1) freestanding sign with greater signage.

Moved: Andris Silins
Seconded: Carole Mulcahy

Vote of the Board

Daniel DeLaus AYE
Michael Belgiorno AYE
Joseph Grussenmeyer AYE
Carole Mulcahy AYE
Andris Silins AYE

The motion to approve the foregoing portion of the application was carried