



PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

MEETING February 1, 2022

9:00A.M.

Brighton
Town Hall

AUDITORIUM ROOM

DRAFT AGENDA

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:

APPROVE MINUTES:

PUBLIC REVIEW OPEN FORUM:

OLD BUSINESS

MATTER RE: Farmers Market Connector and New Building

NEW BUSINESS

MATTER RE: Road Condition Survey

MATTER RE: Clean Heating & Cooling Campaign in Brighton

TREES


MATTER RE:


Address	Description	Recommendation
21 Westland, (Edgemere Side)	18" Norway Maple	Remove and Replace
31 Walden Place, (across from)	44" Silver Maple	Remove
60 Helen Road	36 "White Ash	Remove

MEETING ADJOURNED:


NEXT COMMITTEE MEETING:

March 1, 2022 at 9:00 A.M







1 SECTION at CONNECTOR
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"




2 SECTION at MARKET SHED - OPTION A (OPTION B - DASHED LINE)
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"



3 SECTION at MARKET SHED - OPTION C
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"



LOFT LEVEL FLOOR PLAN
Scale: 3/32" = 1'-0"



MARKET LEVEL FLOOR PLAN
Scale: 3/32" = 1'-0"

FOOTPRINTS (in gross square feet)
EXISTING BARN: 2200 GSF
CONNECTOR: 596 GSF
MARKET SHED: 3266 GSF





BRIGHTON FARMERS MARKET

Massing Concepts for the Winter Market Addition



OPTION A

- north-facing shed roof
- low profile faces market plaza
- deep overhang for protection at entrances and along perimeter of market plaza
- snow guards for snow control
- solar power photovoltaic panels (PV's) on roof
- north facing windows provide consistent light



View from Westfall Road



View from Market Plaza

OPTION B

- south-facing shed roof
- low profile faces Westfall Road
- deep overhang for protection at entrances and along perimeter of market plaza
- snow sheds towards north elevation
- south facing windows to capture abundant light on sunny days
- thin film PV's on roof



View from Westfall Road



View from Market Plaza

OPTION C

- hybrid of Option A and Option B
- dynamic roof form
- deep overhang for protection at entrances and along perimeter of market plaza
- snow guards for snow control
- solar power photovoltaic panels (PV's) on roof



View from Westfall Road



View from Market Plaza



Building and Planning Department

Commissioner of Public Works – Michael Guyon, P.E.

Rick DiStefano
Planner

December 9, 2021

Michael Guyon, Commissioner of Public Works
Town of Brighton
2300 Elmwood Avenue
Rochester, NY 14618

RE: Tree Removals

Dear Commissioner Guyon:

In response to your letter, dated November 29, 2021, and attached tree evaluation forms regarding the proposed removal of town trees located at

21 Westland Ave (Edgemere side)
31 Walden Place (across from)
60 Helen Road

18" Norway maple
44" Silver maple
36" White Ash

the Tree Council reviewed the forms and visited the sites. The Council is in agreement with the evaluations and supports the removal of the identified trees. As recommended the Council agrees that a replacement tree should be planted at 21 Westland Avenue and no replacement tree is warranted at 31 Walden Place. However, regarding 60 Helen Road, investigate planting a replacement tree further to the west (left of driveway) on the property.

Sincerely,

Rick DiStefano, Secretary
Brighton Tree Council



Public Works Department

Mike Guyon, P.E.
Commissioner of Public Works

November 29, 2021

The Honorable Tree Council
Town of Brighton
2300 Elmwood Ave.
Rochester, New York

Re: Trees Evaluations and Recommendations

Honorable Members:

I request your review and comment regarding the proposed recommendations of the following tree(s):

Address	Description	Recommendation
21 Westland, (Edgemere Side)	18" Norway Maple	Remove and Replace
31 Walden Place, (across from)	44" Silver Maple	Remove
60 Helen Road	36 "White Ash	Remove

All of the above trees exhibit compromised health, structural deficiencies and/or safety issues as noted in the attached reports. Each location is a cause for concern of the general public which supports the recommendation to trim, remove and replant these trees as noted.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and I look forward to your review of these trees.

Respectfully,

Michael E. Guyon
Commissioner of Public Works

Attachments

Cc: Steve Zimmer
William Haefner

**TREE HAZARD EVALUATION FORM** 2nd EditionSite/Address: 21 Westland - Edgemere Side

Map/Location: _____

Owner: public ☒ private _____ unknown _____ other _____Date: 10.26.21 Inspector: Zachariah A. Potter Jr.

Date of last inspection: _____

HAZARD RATING:

4	+	4	+	4	=	12
Failure Potential	+	Size of part	+	Target Rating	=	Hazard Rating

☒ Immediate action needed

____ Needs further inspection

☒ Dead tree**TREE CHARACTERISTICS**Tree #: _____ Species: Norway MapleDBH: 4'8" 18" # of trunks: 1 Height: 30 Spread: 25Form: ☐ generally symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry ☐ major asymmetry ☐ stump sprout ☐ stag-headedCrown class: ☐ dominant ☐ co-dominant ☐ intermediate ☐ suppressedLive crown ratio: 0 % Age class: ☐ young ☐ semi-mature ☐ mature ☒ over-mature/senescentPruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced
☐ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approx. dates: _____Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☒ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade ☐ indigenous ☐ protected by gov. agency**TREE HEALTH**Foliage color: ☐ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic Epicormics? Y N

Growth obstructions:

Foliage density: ☐ normal ☐ sparse Leaf size: ☐ normal ☐ small☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cablesAnnual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☐ poor Twig Dieback? Y N☒ curb/pavement ☐ guardsWoundwood development: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☒ poor ☐ none☐ other _____Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☐ fair ☒ poorMajor pests/diseases: Termite - woodpecker holes**SITE CONDITIONS**Site Character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forestLandscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind breakIrrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wettedRecent site disturbance? Y ☒ N ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing

% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement lifted? Y N

% dripline w/ fill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%

% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%

Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ shallow ☐ compacted ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume ☐ disease center ☐ history of fail
☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope _____° aspect: _____Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic ☐ adjacent veg. ☐ _____Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge ☐ area prone to windthrowPrevailing wind direction: _____ Occurrence of snow/ice storms ☐ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly**TARGET**Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☒ parking ☒ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☒ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility linesCan target be moved? Y ☒ N ☐ Can use be restricted? Y ☒ N ☐Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☒ constant use

TREE DEFECTS

ROOT DEFECTS:

Suspect root rot: ☒ Y ☐ N Mushroom/conk/bracket present: ☒ Y ☐ N ID: _____

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☒ low Undersided: ☐ severe ☒ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: _____ distance from trunk Root area affected: _____ % Buttress wounded: Y ☒ N When: _____

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☒ moderate ☐ low Potential for root failure: ☒ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: _____ deg. from vertical ☐ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected Soil heaving: Y ☐ N

Decay in plane of lean: Y ☐ N Roots broken Y ☐ N Soil cracking: Y ☐ N

Compounding factors: _____ Lean severity: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

CROWN DEFECTS: Indicate presence of individual defects and rate their severity (s = severe, m = moderate, l = low)

DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Codominants/forks			X	
Multiple attachments			X	X
Included bark	X	X	X	X
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits	X	X	X	
Hangers			X	X
Girdling				
Wounds/seam	X	X	X	
Decay	X	X	X	X
Cavity				
Conks/mushrooms/bracket				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Loose/cracked bark	X	X	X	X
Nesting hole/bee hive	X	X	X	
Deadwood/stubs			X	X
Bore/termite/ants	X	X	X	X
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure		X	X	X

HAZARD RATING

Tree part most likely to fail: Trunk at base

Inspection period: _____ annual _____ biannual _____ other _____

Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Rating = Hazard Rating

4 + 4 + 4 = 12

Failure potential: 1 - low; 2 - medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe

Size of part: 1 - <6" (15 cm); 2 - 6-18" (15-45 cm);

3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - >30" (75 cm)

Target rating: 1 - occasional use; 2 intermittent use;

3 - frequent use; 4 - constant use

HAZARD ABATEMENT

Prune: ☐ remove defective part ☐ reduce end weight ☐ crown clean ☐ thin ☐ raise canopy ☐ crown reduce ☐ restructure ☐ shape

Cable/Brace: _____ Inspect further: ☐ root crown ☐ decay ☐ aerial ☐ monitor

Remove tree ☒ Y ☐ N Replace? ☒ Y ☐ N Move target: Y ☒ N Other: _____

Effect on adjacent trees: ☒ none ☐ evaluate

Notification: ☐ owner ☐ manager ☒ governing agency Date: 10.26.21

COMMENTS

Tree is dead. Most likely to fail at base of trunk due to termite infestation.

2P





**TREE HAZARD EVALUATION FORM** 2nd EditionSite/Address: Across from 31 Walder

Map/Location: _____

Owner: public ☒ private _____ unknown _____ other _____Date: 11/15/2021 Inspector: Zachariah A. Polier Jr.

Date of last inspection: _____

HAZARD RATING:

$$\begin{array}{rclcl} 4 & + & 4 & + & 4 & = & 12 \\ \text{Failure} & + & \text{Size} & + & \text{Target} & = & \text{Hazard} \\ \text{Potential} & & \text{of part} & & \text{Rating} & & \text{Rating} \end{array}$$

☒ Immediate action needed☐ Needs further inspection☒ Dead tree**TREE CHARACTERISTICS**Tree #: _____ Species: Silver MapleDBH: 11.5 # of trunks: 4 Height: 60+ Spread: 25+Form: ☒ generally symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry ☐ major asymmetry ☐ stump sprout ☐ stag-headedCrown class: ☐ dominant ☒ co-dominant ☐ intermediate ☐ suppressedLive crown ratio: 10 % Age class: ☐ young ☐ semi-mature ☐ mature ☒ over-mature/senescentPruning history: ☐ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☐ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced ☐ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced
☐ none ☐ multiple pruning events Approx. dates: _____Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☒ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade ☐ indigenous ☐ protected by gov. agency**TREE HEALTH**Foliage color: ☐ normal ☒ chlorotic ☒ necrotic Epidermies? ☒ Y ☐ NFoliage density: ☐ normal ☒ sparse Leaf size: ☐ normal ☒ smallAnnual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☒ poor Twig Dieback? ☒ Y ☐ NWoundwood development: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☒ poor ☒ noneVigor class: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☐ fair ☒ poorMajor pests/diseases: Animals, fungus**Growth obstructions:**☐ stakes ☐ wire/ties ☐ signs ☐ cables☒ curb/pavement ☐ guards☐ other _____**SITE CONDITIONS**Site Character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forestLandscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind breakIrrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wettedRecent site disturbance? ☒ Y ☐ N ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing% dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement lifted? ☒ Y ☐ N% dripline w/ fill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%

% dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%

Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ shallow ☐ compacted ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume ☐ disease center ☐ history of fail
☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope _____° aspect: _____Obstructions: ☒ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☒ overhead lines ☒ underground utilities ☒ traffic ☐ adjacent veg. ☐ _____Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge ☒ area prone to windthrowPrevailing wind direction: West Occurrence of snow/ice storms ☐ never ☐ seldom ☒ regularly**TARGET**Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☒ parking ☒ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☒ recreation ☐ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility linesCan target be moved? ☐ Y ☐ N Can use be restricted? ☐ Y ☐ NOccupancy: ☐ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☒ frequent use ☐ constant use

TREE DEFECTS

ROOT DEFECTS:

Suspect root rot: ☒ Y ☐ N Mushroom/conk/bracket present: ☒ Y ☐ N ID: _____

Exposed roots: ☒ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low Undermined: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: _____ distance from trunk Root area affected: _____ % Buttress wounded: ☐ Y ☐ N When: _____

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low Potential for root failure: ☐ severe ☒ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: _____ deg. from vertical ☐ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected Soil heaving: ☒ Y ☐ N

Decay in plane of lean: ☒ Y ☐ N Roots broken ☐ Y ☒ N Soil cracking: ☒ Y ☐ N

Compounding factors: _____ Lean severity: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

CROWN DEFECTS: Indicate presence of individual defects and rate their severity (s = severe, m = moderate, l = low)

DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep				
Codominants/forks		X	X	
Multiple attachments				
Included bark	X	X	X	
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits	X	X	X	
Hangers			X	X
Girdling	X			
Wounds/seam		X	X	X
Decay	X	X	X	X
Cavity		X	X	X
Conks/mushrooms/bracket		X	X	X
Bleeding/sap flow		X		
Loose/cracked bark		X	X	X
(Nesting hole)/bee hive		X	X	
Deadwood/stubs		X	X	X
Borers/termites/ants	X	X	X	X
Cankers/galls/burls		X	X	
Previous failure		X	X	X

HAZARD RATING

Tree part most likely to fail: Trunks, Scaffolds, branches

Inspection period: _____ annual _____ biannual _____ other _____

Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Rating = Hazard Rating

4 + 4 + 4 = 12

Failure potential: 1 - low; 2 - medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe

Size of part: 1 - <6" (15 cm); 2 - 6-18" (15-45 cm);
3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - >30" (75 cm)

Target rating: 1 - occasional use; 2 intermittent use;
3 - frequent use; 4 - constant use

HAZARD ABATEMENT

Prune: ☐ remove defective part ☐ reduce end weight ☐ crown clean ☐ thin ☐ raise canopy ☐ crown reduce ☐ restructure ☐ shape

Cable/Brace: _____ Inspect further: ☐ root crown ☐ decay ☐ aerial ☐ monitor

Remove tree: ☒ Y ☐ N Replace? ☐ Y ☒ N Move target: ☐ Y ☒ N Other: _____


Effect on adjacent trees: ☐ none ☐ evaluate

Notification: ☐ owner ☐ manager ☒ governing agency

Date: 11.12.21

COMMENTS









A Photographic Guide to the Evaluation of Hazard Trees in Urban Areas

TREE HAZARD EVALUATION FORM 2nd Edition

Site/Address: 60 Helen
 Map/Location: _____
 Owner: public _____ private ☒ unknown _____ other _____
 Date: 10.21.21 Inspector: Zachariah A. Butler Jr.
 Date of last inspection: _____

HAZARD RATING:

4 + 4 + 4 = 12
 Failure Potential + Size of part + Target Rating = Hazard Rating

☒ Immediate action needed

☐ Needs further inspection

☒ Dead tree

TREE CHARACTERISTICS

Tree #: 1 Species: Ash
 DBH: 94 36" # of trunks: 1 Height: 50 Spread: 45
 Form: ☒ generally symmetric ☐ minor asymmetry ☐ major asymmetry ☐ stump sprout ☐ stag-headed
 Crown class: ☐ dominant ☒ co-dominant ☐ intermediate ☐ suppressed
 Live crown ratio: 20 % Age class: ☐ young ☐ semi-mature ☒ mature ☐ over-mature/senescent
 Pruning history: ☒ crown cleaned ☐ excessively thinned ☐ topped ☒ crown raised ☐ pollarded ☐ crown reduced ☒ flush cuts ☐ cabled/braced
☐ none ☒ multiple pruning events Approx. dates: _____
 Special Value: ☐ specimen ☐ heritage/historic ☐ wildlife ☐ unusual ☐ street tree ☐ screen ☐ shade ☐ indigenous ☐ protected by gov. agency

TREE HEALTH

Foliage color: ☐ normal ☐ chlorotic ☐ necrotic Epicormics? Y N
 Foliage density: ☐ normal ☒ sparse Leaf size: ☐ normal ☒ small
 Annual shoot growth: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☐ poor Twig Dieback? ☒ Y N
 Woundwood development: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☒ poor ☐ none
 Vigor class: ☐ excellent ☐ average ☐ fair ☐ poor
 Major pests/diseases: Ants - Termites - woodpecker holes.

SITE CONDITIONS

Site Character: ☒ residence ☐ commercial ☐ industrial ☐ park ☐ open space ☐ natural ☐ woodland/forest
 Landscape type: ☐ parkway ☐ raised bed ☐ container ☐ mound ☐ lawn ☐ shrub border ☐ wind break
 Irrigation: ☒ none ☐ adequate ☐ inadequate ☐ excessive ☐ trunk wetted
 Recent site disturbance? Y ☒ N ☐ construction ☐ soil disturbance ☐ grade change ☐ line clearing ☐ site clearing
 % dripline paved: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100% Pavement lifted? Y N
 % dripline w/ fill soil: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%
 % dripline grade lowered: 0% 10-25% 25-50% 50-75% 75-100%
 Soil problems: ☐ drainage ☐ shallow ☐ compacted ☐ droughty ☐ saline ☐ alkaline ☐ acidic ☐ small volume ☐ disease center ☐ history of fail
☐ clay ☐ expansive ☐ slope _____° aspect: _____
 Obstructions: ☐ lights ☐ signage ☐ line-of-sight ☐ view ☐ overhead lines ☐ underground utilities ☐ traffic ☐ adjacent veg. ☐ _____
 Exposure to wind: ☐ single tree ☐ below canopy ☐ above canopy ☐ recently exposed ☐ windward, canopy edge ☐ area prone to windthrow
 Prevailing wind direction: _____ Occurrence of snow/ice storms ☐ never ☐ seldom ☐ regularly

TARGET

Use Under Tree: ☐ building ☒ parking ☒ traffic ☒ pedestrian ☒ recreation ☒ landscape ☐ hardscape ☐ small features ☐ utility lines
 Can target be moved? Y ☒ N ☐ Can use be restricted? Y ☒ N ☐
 Occupancy: ☐ occasional use ☐ intermittent use ☐ frequent use ☒ constant use

TREE DEFECTS

ROOT DEFECTS:

Suspect root rot: Y ☒ N Mushroom/conk/bracket present: Y ☒ ID: _____

Exposed roots: ☐ severe ☒ moderate ☐ low Undermined: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

Root pruned: _____ distance from trunk Root area affected: _____% Buttress wounded: Y N When: _____

Restricted root area: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low Potential for root failure: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

LEAN: _____ deg. from vertical ☐ natural ☐ unnatural ☐ self-corrected Soil heaving: Y N

Decay in plane of lean: Y N Roots broken Y N Soil cracking: Y N

Compounding factors: _____ Lean severity: ☐ severe ☐ moderate ☐ low

CROWN DEFECTS: Indicate presence of individual defects and rate their severity (s = severe, m = moderate, l = low)

DEFECT	ROOT CROWN	TRUNK	SCAFFOLDS	BRANCHES
Poor taper				
Bow, sweep			X	
Codominants/forks		X	X	X
Multiple attachments		X	X	X
Included bark		X	X	X
Excessive end weight				
Cracks/splits		X	X	X
Hangers				
Girdling				
Wounds/seam		X	X	X
Decay		X	X	X
Cavity			X	X
Conks/mushrooms/bracket				
Bleeding/sap flow				
Lobse/cracked bark		X	X	X
Nesting hole/bee hive		X	X	X
Deadwood/stubs			X	X
Borer/termites/ants		X	X	X
Cankers/galls/burls				
Previous failure			X	X

HAZARD RATING

Tree part most likely to fail: Scaffolds - trunk

Inspection period: _____ annual _____ biannual _____ other _____

Failure Potential + Size of Part + Target Rating = Hazard Rating

4 + 4 + 4 = 12

Failure potential: 1 - low; 2 - medium; 3 - high; 4 - severe

Size of part: 1 - <6" (15 cm); 2 - 6-18" (15-45 cm);
3 - 18-30" (45-75 cm); 4 - >30" (75 cm)

Target rating: 1 - occasional use; 2 intermittent use;
3 - frequent use; 4 - constant use

HAZARD ABATEMENT

Prune: ☐ remove defective part ☐ reduce end weight ☐ crown clean ☐ thin ☐ raise canopy ☐ crown reduce ☐ restructure ☐ shape

Cable/Brace: _____ Inspect further: ☐ root crown ☐ decay ☐ aerial ☐ monitor

Remove tree: ☒ Y ☐ N Replace? Y ☒ N Move target: Y ☒ N Other: _____

Effect on adjacent trees: ☒ none ☐ evaluate

Notification: ☐ owner ☐ manager ☒ governing agency

Date: 10-21-21

COMMENTS







60 Helen rd