

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

B R I G H T O N
Z O N I N G B O A R D
O F
A P P E A L S

MARCH 5th, 2025
at approximately 7:00 **p.m.**
2300 Elmwood Avenue
Rochester, New York 14618

PRESENT:

DENNIS MIETZ, Chairperson

MATTHEW D'AUGUSTINE)
HEATHER McKAY-DRURY)
EDWARD F. PREMO, II) BOARD MEMBERS
JUDY SCHWARTZ)
ANDREA TOMPKINS WRIGHT)

LAUREN BARON, ESQ.
Town Attorney

RICK DiSTEFANO
Senior Planner

NOT PRESENT:
KATHLEEN SCHMITT

REPORTED BY: Rhoda Collins, Court Reporter
FORBES COURT REPORTING SERVICES, LLC
21 Woodcrest Drive
Batavia, New York 14020

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

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

Rick, was the meeting properly advertised?

MR. DiSTEFANO: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it was advertised in the Daily Record edition of February 27, 2025.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Will you please call the roll?

MR. DiSTEFANO: Please let the record show Ms. Schmitt is not present.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Anything you would like to bring to our attention?

MR. DiSTEFANO: A couple things in your folder. I don't know if anyone has any questions regarding the applications.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. We have one postponement.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Yes. If anybody is in the audience for 2A-06-25, that has to do with 2369 East Avenue, that has been postponed to the April 2nd meeting.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay.

Any other questions? All set?

Okay. Let's go to the first application.

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. DiSTEFANO: The minutes.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Oh, I'm sorry.

Okay. Minutes, any comments on the minutes?

MS. SCHWARTZ: None. They were great.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Okay. Motion to approve.

MR. D'AUGUSTINE: Motion to approve.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Second.

MR. DiSTEFANO: The motion is to approve.

Mr. Premo?

MR. PREMO: These are the January 2nd? Yes, I
abstain.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Ms. Schwartz?

MS. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Ms. Tompkins Wright?

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Mr. D'Augustine?

MR. D'AUGUSTINE: Yes.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Mr. Mietz?

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Yes.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Ms. McKay-Drury?

MS. MCKAY-DRURY: Yes.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Minutes are approved.

Ready?

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Yes.

APPLICATION 3A-01-25

3A-01-25 Application of Kirk Wright, Sign and Lighting Services LLC, agent, and CRE JV Mixed Five NY 4 (Citizens Bank), owner of property located at 2000 Monroe Avenue, for a Sign Variance from Section 207-32 to allow for the installation of a freestanding sign where not allowed by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

KIRK WRIGHT: Good evening. Kirk Wright, Sign and Lighting Services, 530 State Route 104, Ontario, New York. I have Steve Skello from Citizens Bank here with me this evening.

We are looking for, to add a freestanding, small monument sign in front of the bank. There is some challenges with the property due to brush, bushes and trees as you approach from the one direction. Approaching from the other direction, they actually have a large tree in front of their own property that obstructs the building, so that makes it difficult to see that they are back there.

The sign is a routed aluminum sign. The Citizens portion would illuminate, it would not be a big green beacon by any means.

And, they are just obviously trying to direct

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

the customers, make sure that, you know, no one is panicking in the last moment when they realize they are about to pass the bank.

There is a 24-hour ATM at this property, so they would like to leave the sign illuminated, 24 hours, dusk to dawn.

And it's a business area. There's a lot of signage in the area. We don't feel it would have any adverse effect to the neighborhood.

MR. D'AUGUSTINE: In terms of the foliage that is surrounding Buckman Creek, was anyone in contact with the town in terms of maintaining that or trimming it back or anything of that nature?

STEVE SKELLO: I would have to get back to you on that.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Excuse me, sir, name and address?

STEVE SKELLO: Steve Skello, 2000, the business address on Monroe Avenue. As far as the tree on our property, we wanted to keep the tree. We certainly do not want to -- we will trim it back, whatever is healthy for the tree. We don't want the tree to come.

I would have to see what contact with the town

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

on the other side of the property. This branch also has a live drive up, a manned drive up, so we have a lot of our other branches that are in plazas that don't have that facility. We have some people that go to this branch specifically because of that and they aren't necessarily always familiar with the area.

There is new construction on the corner that is kind of even causing a little bit more harder, making it harder for some customers to see.

MR. D'AUGUSTINE: Do you have a sense of, you know, customers making comments or?

STEVE SKELLO: We have had that. We have several thousand households that use this branch at one time or another throughout the year. We have had, you know, customers saying that it has been challenging to find. We are spending quite a bit of money to reface the whole branch and help that as well.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. Other questions?

MS. SCHWARTZ: You are saying that the sign has to be six feet high?

KIRK WRIGHT: In the Citizens Bank signage portfolio, that's the smallest one that they have. So, that's the one that we've gone with.

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

MS. SCHWARTZ: Well, six feet is quite tall. It's not that commercial of an area, truly, truly. Okay? And as far as speed is concerned, I don't think people should be missing it because there's a school right there, and the administration building is right there and you are coming up to a light, so. You know, if you are coming from Pittsford and likewise, if you are coming from the city there are crossing guards all over early in the morning and things settle down after 10:00 in the morning.

But, I am just concerned about the size. I think it's going to hit people in the face and I just thought something could be smaller really.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. Other questions?

MR. DiSTEFANO: A couple questions. So, how long has it been a Citizens branch there?

STEVE SKELLO: I have been with the company 23 years and it's been that long. Or Charter One before that, and during that acquisition it became a Citizens Bank.

MR. DiSTEFANO: And how long do you think it's been a bank in general?

STEVE SKELLO: I couldn't tell you that, at least 25 years.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: I think it's been a bank

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

before that.

MR. DiSTEFANO: It's been a bank since I have been with the town, so.

And, you are planning this entire painting, green color scheme to match the branding of Citizens. Do you think that in itself is going to draw people to the branch? Seeing the green and white, seeing the building face sign and everything?

STEVE SKELLO: I'm not an expert, but I certainly think that would certainly help. Right now, it's a pretty drab brick building. It kind of blends into the --

MR. DiSTEFANO: It's a brick building that needs some help.

STEVE SKELLO: Absolutely.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Is there landscape improvements that you are going to change?

STEVE SKELLO: We have a whole package that we will be putting together, get some concrete.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Enhance, okay. So you are going to clean up the whole site?

STEVE SKELLO: Yes.

MR. D'AUGUSTINE: Would you be willing to do

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

some landscaping in front of the sign itself?

STEVE SKELLO: That would not be my -- there's not a ton of room there, so I don't know how much we would be able to do even if we wanted to. I don't think we're looking to add more, probably something to clean up more than anything else.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: The site map that shows the location of the full signage package, this one that requires a variance is S15, but across the entryways and drive aisle is S12. What signage is that, a directional sign?

STEVE SKELLO: I think, I don't know the numbers. But, I think it says enter, I think, and an exit sign on the other side. I believe that's what it is.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Okay.

STEVE SKELLO: It's small.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Okay.

STEVE SKELLO: And that's not illuminated, as far as I know.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: For illumination, what are the bank's hours?

STEVE SKELLO: We are Monday through Thursday

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

9:00 to 4:00, we are 9:00 to 5:00 on Friday and 9:00 to 12:00 on Saturday.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Okay. So what is the purpose of illumination if it's not --

STEVE SKELLO: Well, at certain times of the year -- it's not a real bright illumination. We have this sign at many of our branches. It's really a dull light more than anything.

KIRK WRIGHT: The ATM is 24 hours.

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Okay.

MR. DiSTEFANO: One other thing, can -- we don't have a site map here so it is hard to tell what your distance off the front property line is. You know, you do have Elmwood Avenue right of way, you are on the opposite side of the sidewalk a little bit, can you give me any idea of how much you are off that front property line?

KIRK WRIGHT: We would move it back as far as needed.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Yeah. It doesn't really give me a, how far back are you from the front property line question.

KIRK WRIGHT: 15 feet?

MR. DiSTEFANO: From the front property line or

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

from the edge of the pavement?

KIRK WRIGHT: From the edge of the road.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Right. So, there's the right of way goes into that area, there's the State right of way. Just so you know, that Monroe Avenue will be going through a makeover within the next couple years. Whether or not there will be any takings in there, that is hard to know at this point, but you are pretty close to that front property line.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. Questions, anymore?
Thank you, gentlemen.

KIRK WRIGHT: I did notice that First, is it First National?

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Where is that, sir?

KIRK WRIGHT: Right on 12 Corners, they have their name on the sign out front.

STEVE SKELLO: Five Star.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Oh, you're talking about on the clock sign. That goes back many years.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Many, many many, many years.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Because it is owned by the bank, that sign, so it doesn't --

KIRK WRIGHT: Is CVS in Brighton, the one right down the street?

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Yes.

KIRK WRIGHT: They have a similar sign there.

MR. DiSTEFANO: CVS has a similar sign, however, that was done under a totally different process than a variance. They went through incentive zoning and the Town Board granted them the incentive of a freestanding sign for certain amenities as part of the redevelopment of that project from when it was a hotel, a not very nice hotel. And CVS came in, bought the property, cleaned the property, built the CVS. And for that, the town was very grateful. And part of the incentive zoning, that was one of the amenities, that was one of the incentives granted to the CVS from the town. So, hard to compare the two on that one.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay.

MS. SCHWARTZ: I have one more question. I don't recall what the wording is on your two signs at the driveway. Can you describe what the wording is?

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: At the where, Judy? Speak into the mic.

MS. SCHWARTZ: On your little signs in the driveway, what is the wording on there?

KIRK WRIGHT: Enter and exit, I thought.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Okay.

1 BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

2
3 KIRK WRIGHT: Yeah.

4 CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay, gentlemen, thank
5 you.

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

9 APPLICATION 3A-02-25

10 3A-02-25 Application of Serge Tsvasman, agent,
11 and Paul Henry, owner of property located at 482 Antlers
12 Drive, for an Area Variance from Section 205-2 to allow the
13 reconstruction of an attached garage and construction of a
14 building addition to extend 1.5 ft. into the 12.75 ft. side
15 setback required by code. All as described on application
16 and plans on file.

17 SERGE TSVASMAN: Hi. I'm Serge, I work for
18 Design Works Architecture representing the Henry family. The
19 address is 6 North Main Street, Fairport, New York, 14450.

20 CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Maybe pull the mic up a
21 little bit.

22 SERGE TSVASMAN: I think it's Suite 140.
23 Can you hear me okay?

24 CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Yes. It's the Court
25 Reporter that needs to hear.

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

SERGE TSVASMAN: Okay. So, the Henrys would like to remain in their house that they have been in for over 20 years now. They need to do some renovations and an addition to have a first floor living situation so they can continue to be in that home for the next 20 years or so.

So that involved a first floor master, taking down the existing garage and rebuilding it. The minimum increase for that garage and a mudroom/laundry room were considered. The outcome is a need to be in that setback about a foot and a half. So, we are increasing the overall width of the house by 3'2" approximately.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay.

SERGE TSVASMAN: Visually, it appears the adjacent neighbor's house is closer to the property line than what we were even requesting, so I wanted to make that a consideration for the Board as well. They're also on board and are aware of the project and have no issues with this increase into that setback by a foot and a half.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. Are you relatively familiar with the neighborhood as far as other similar types of construction, additions?

SERGE TSVASMAN: Yeah. So, what's unique is, typically done new homes on that street already, and

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

typically there's already a setback issue, a nonconforming existing situation. So, in this case we are actually creating a situation which wasn't there. Which, I think is, you know, a kind of a unicorn in that neighborhood. But the increase I think is minimal, so hopefully the Board will approve that.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: And did you look at any other alternatives that would minimize it further that made sense with or didn't make sense?

SERGE TSVASMAN: For the design it made the most sense to kind of maintain the location of the existing kitchen and to maintain existing circulation in the house. So, the thought was originally to set everything back further in the backyard, which I think wouldn't have worked well and wouldn't have connected the new master suite to the living of everyday day life in the home. So, that was the consideration.

So, there is also a 50-foot setback at the front that allows us to make this move, which I think will improve the house. We did present to the ARB a week ago and they have no issues there.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay. Other questions?

MR. PREMO: I assume the size of the garage is

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

to allow two cars to be parked and stored?

SERGE TSVASMAN: That is correct.

MR. PREMO: Making the garage smaller would interfere with that use?

SERGE TSVASMAN: Yeah. I think currently they have a garage that doesn't serve that purpose. I think, you know, it's got to be smaller. It's got to be 17 feet wide and they certainly can't park two cars in there. It does have a wide overhead door, but I am not sure what happened there, but I don't think there was ever a scenario where two cars could ever fit in there. It seems like the right thing to do. Modern vehicles, really 20 feet, probably the most minimum width I would do for new automobiles.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay, very good. Other questions?

Thank you very much.

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

MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: I'm recusing myself from Application 3A-03-25.

APPLICATION 3A-03-25

3A-03-25 Application of Jack Savage, Passero

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

Associates, agent, and the University of Rochester, owner of property located at 250 East River Road, for renewal of a Temporary and Revocable Use Permit (7A-06-23) pursuant to Section 219-4 to allow a new mobile PET/CT scanner (trailer) to be on site until April 30, 2026. All as described an application and plans on file.

JOSHUA SAXTON: My name is Joshua Saxton, project manager at Passero Associates 242 West Main Street in Rochester, New York.

KIRK SIMPSON: Kirk Simpson, University of Rochester, 250 East River Road.

JOSHUA SAXTON: And this is Jack Savage, also from Passero Associates, same address.

We are here for the application presented, which is a new temporary use permit for a new PET/CT scanner located at the existing imaging center at 200 East River Road. It is located kind of southwest corner of the building exterior, kind of right parallel with the access drive around the site.

Just to give a little history on the pad and the whole trailer. Back in 2020, obviously during the height of COVID, the MRI trailer was actually installed at that same location. It required a special use permit for it, mainly to

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

meet the needs of the MRI, or trailer needs that the University has at the facility.

You know, every couple years that van kind of dwindled and there wasn't really a need for that MRI, so kind of utilizing that same space. That's when a PET/CT scanner was installed in 2022 in a temporary trailer.

The University has come back for extensions, meaning 2023, which is set to expire in July of this year. And we are basically applying for another temporary application to put in a new PET/CT scanner, mainly to get it over the finish line of, in a year having, you know, a permanent facility for this installed at the hospital and also an imaging center at the same location, but in the building.

I guess, the need for it is, is there, you know, not similar to the original MRI trailer, the need for these PET scans have only gone up year over year, 2022 to 2024 it went up over 50 percent, and that trend is not going down. They're finding new uses for this technology and just the demands keeping to increase. So it's not keeping it just to keep it there, it's the demand for it.

You know, I would also say, keeping it on site, having this temporary trailer wasn't ever the end goal

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

1
2
3 and it's not, you know, financially, you know, a good option
4 to keep going forward renting the trailer. You know, it's
5 rented, it's not owned, so that is a lot of money that is
6 being spent on this. It's not like it's, you know, a money
7 printer that they want to keep there. It is something they
8 want to move away from to get a permanent solution that not
9 only, you know, benefits people using it because that will be
10 inside, and more accessible, but also better benefit the
11 community based on those demands they are constantly seeing
12 for it.

13 So, we did, looking into it, try to look at
14 other options that maybe wouldn't require this. And one
15 thing was seeing if there was a way to make the existing
16 trailer a permanent structure so that we wouldn't need this
17 variance or the temporary use permit.

18 You know, but in talking with the State and
19 kind of going through those options. It wasn't really found
20 that, you know, a trailer can be modified in the way the
21 State would approve that variance. So, we weren't pursuing
22 other options to, you know, not have it -- or have it, but
23 have it be in code per se.

24 So, that was kind of one of the options we
25 went through, you know, wasn't necessarily feasible to get

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

1
2
3 something there in the short time frame from now, to when the
4 permanent solution is going to be there to warrant, have
5 something installed that will meet it.

6 So, that is kind of why we are here. To get
7 one of those temporary permits, similar to what was there
8 before, but it is a new trailer, the one there is ten years
9 old. The newer trailer is more efficient and kind of just to
10 bridge the gap from now in the year when those facilities are
11 up and running. That, you know, maintaining that service to
12 the community that the data shows only going up and really
13 beneficial.

14 It is tucked in the corner, it's not right out
15 in front. It is kind of in the campus area of the imaging
16 facility already. And, yeah, I don't know if there's
17 anything else you want to add?

18 KIRK SIMPSON: I do want to add, we did look
19 at trying to meet the requirements of the State and
20 everything. That would require purchasing basically a
21 double-wide trailer that does meet all those requirements.
22 So, it actually would have been a worse alternative,
23 essentially to go that route.

24 The permanent solution is in process and
25 design right now to go into East River Road. We are hoping

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

1
2
3 to have that done at the end of this. Either way, we are
4 committed to making it work and to be off site at that time.
5 So, we are in process on that final solution to do that.

6 Thank you.

7 JOSHUA SAXTON: We are here to answer any
8 questions.

9 CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Questions, anyone?

10 So, obviously we can't roll dice here, but,
11 you know, is the solution going to be within the existing
12 building or are you requiring construction?

13 KIRK SIMPSON: It will be within --

14 CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Well, it's just
15 modification of the existing space.

16 KIRK SIMPSON: Yes. It is all going along
17 well and we are committed. We will actually take down, the
18 power we will decommission that entire area. If we're
19 allowed to, we will keep the pad and, you know, put a pergola
20 or something over it nice for amenities or if we want to
21 decommission it, so it's -- we can't come back --

22 CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: I understand. It is not a
23 cost effective way. Okay.

24 Any other questions?

25 MS. BARON: I had a couple questions for

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

clarification purposes. So, the old trailer is being removing to make room for the new trailer, correct?

JOSHUA SAXTON: Yes.

MS. BARON: And then, I wanted to clarify, what is the time line that you are asking for the approval from? Are you asking for it from July 2025 to April 2026 or are you -- because I wrote down March 30, 2025, through June 30, 2026. So, I wanted to clarify the dates you are asking for.

JOSHUA SAXTON: I think the June one would be the priority for that.

KIRK SIMPSON: Right now our time frame for the final solution puts us roughly into the May/June time frame. So, the June time frame would definitely be ideal.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: I think the way you advertised it was April 30th.

MS. BARON: There was different information, I thought, in the application. I was seeing a couple dates.

MR. DiSTEFANO: I did what I assumed was their date of April 30, 2026. I was going to ask a question, basically what Lauren was saying, so construction hasn't started yet?

KIRK SIMPSON: Or design. We are working with

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

the architect.

MR. DiSTEFANO: We are basically a year and a couple months out.

KIRK SIMPSON: We are anticipating a year from now. We are about part way through design, so we are in pretty good shape.

MR. DiSTEFANO: Let me ask a different question: When do you feel you will start construction?

KIRK SIMPSON: We expect about four/five months of design and then we will go right into construction. We are going to prepurchase many things. The site was built for the MRI for imaging equipment, so we do -- it was constructed for that, so it's a less invasive construction process.

MR. DiSTEFANO: You feel a seven-month construction --

KIRK SIMPSON: It's tight. That's why at the end of the day we will commit to whatever is agreed to here and not come back.

MR. DiSTEFANO: I guess that's kind of where I'm going at. I mean, we're not, you know, if you need to give yourself a month or two, is this giving, June, giving yourself a month or two?

1 BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

2
3 KIRK SIMPSON: It puts us pretty tight,
4 honestly. We can survive maybe two weeks, you know, with it
5 down and increase hours and it's a stretch for staff.

6 MR. DiSTEFANO: So what you are saying is if
7 that date comes you will remove the trailer even though the
8 interior, the new one is not up and running?

9 KIRK SIMPSON: Yes.

10 CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Up to them.

11 MR. DiSTEFANO: Only saying, if you did want
12 to extend it, you could request the extension right now.

13 KIRK SIMPSON: I'll request that extension
14 then right now, because --

15 MR. DiSTEFANO: Well, you have to give us a
16 date. What date are we looking here that we can say --

17 CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: What's realistic?

18 KIRK SIMPSON: I think August would be a
19 realistic date.

20 MS. SCHWARTZ: Of 2026?

21 CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: August 1st?

22 KIRK SIMPSON: Yes. Give us to the end of
23 August because of with everything going on currently, we
24 don't know tariffs and trade, you know, what could possibly
25 happen, so realistically, you know, we are all kind of

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

panicking.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Yeah. It's just, you know, again, managing is a project, you have to have a date and that's what you're going to do.

So, as long as you can fit it within that window, because they have to come back again, it is less work. Okay. So you would wish to amend it to August 30, 2026?

KIRK SIMPSON: Yes, thank you.

MS. McKAY-DRURY: 31st.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: That's right, correct. Thank you.

Any other questions?

Thank you.

APPLICATION OF 3A-04-25

3A-04-25 Application of Betsy Brugg, Woods Oviatt Gilman LLP, agent, and 3108 East Avenue LLC, owner of property located at 3108 East Avenue, for a Use Variance from Section 203-44 to allow a gas station with convenience store to be located in a BE-1 Office and Office Park District where not allowed by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

APPLICATION 3A-05-25

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

Application of Betsy Brugg, Woods Oviatt
Gilman LLP, agent, and 3108 East Avenue LLC, owner of
property located at 3108 East Avenue, for Area Variances from
Section 205-18 to 1) allow parking of vehicles to within 2
ft. Of a side lot line (north) where a 10 ft. Setback is
required by code, and 2) to allow paved areas / drive aisles
up to the front lot line where a 20 ft. Setback is required
by code. All as described on application and plans on file.
APPLICATION 3A-06-25

3A-06-25 Application of Betsy Brugg, Woods
Oviatt Gilman LLP, agent, and 3108 East Avenue LLC, owner of
property located at 3108 East Avenue, for an Area Variance
from Section 207-6B to allow an accessory structure (gas pump
canopy) to be located in a front yard in lieu of the rear
yard as required by code. All as described on application
and plans on file.

MS. BRUGG: Good evening. Nice to be here.
My name is Betsy Brugg from Woods, Oviatt, Gilman.

Many of you were here when I was here a few
years ago for these applications. I think most of you are,
haven't changed so hopefully you have some recognition of
what was a very lengthy review process at that time.

So, we are here tonight to request re-approval

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

1
2
3 of variances granted in November of 2022. At that time PEMM
4 was co-applicant on the application, had been working on this
5 project continuously since that time. They had entered into
6 a contingent contract to acquire the property for the
7 development of a Quicklee's station and convenience store.

8 The contract was contingent obviously on the
9 securing of the municipal approvals and various governmental
10 approvals required to develop/redevelop the site.

11 The Zoning Board granted the use variance and
12 several area variances for the property. It took a few
13 months until they were able to secure site plan approval.
14 That didn't come until May of 2023, during that time they
15 also had gone through the Historic Preservation Commission as
16 you might recall. There was a lot of work that went into the
17 design of the building, the redevelopment of the site, the
18 canopy design and so forth.

19 After they secured all their approvals, they
20 had to go through the postapproval steps that are required
21 working with the getting permits from the New York State
22 Department of Transportation, the Department of Health. I
23 think they had some challenges with RG&E.

24 So, again, this takes more time. The code has
25 a pretty limited time period for securing a building permit

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

1
2
3 before approvals expire. During that time they were also
4 working on the development of their other location over at
5 12 Corners.

6 And while they're working on this process they
7 also have to deal with contract issues and now they need to
8 request an extension of their contract that they've already
9 gone so far through this process securing approvals, they
10 needed to negotiate to extend the time period to complete the
11 approval process.

12 All of that goes on, at the same time Lou
13 Terrignoli who was with the company a long time kind of took
14 this project through the approval process, left the company,
15 took a different job. Now they didn't have the same person
16 running the project and inadvertently through the process the
17 year period runs out, so that brings us to the need for
18 re-approvals for the project.

19 Absolutely nothing about the project has
20 changed at all. It's the same project that you saw back in
21 2022, 2023. I think they started with Historic Preservation
22 Commission in January and I think they were -- I don't think
23 there was a change, but a discrepancy or clarification
24 required regarding, I think, was it the windows? Just kind
25 of the window work, work around the windows and that was

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

clarified. That's really the only thing I can identify that has changed.

In the meantime, they acquired the property, they're getting ready to move forward, they have been working diligently on this project, but we do need to secure re-approval of the use variance, the area variances, site plan approval and go to through the whole process. That is what is required by the Town Code, so we are going through that process.

I am prepared to go through each of the variances separately, I will start that and if you want more detail I am happy to give you more. I don't know. There's a lot of material, so you actually do have everything in your record. I tried to give you not only the original submission, but there were a lot of questions and issues that came up.

I think the canopy was reduced in size during the review process. There were some design issues, traffic information was requested, lighting was modified. All of those things kind of came up because this Board really worked this application package pretty much in detail back when you first saw it.

So, I tried to give you all of the

1
2
3 documentation that supported how you arrived at your final
4 point of granting approval for the project. So, I have
5 resubmitted a packet of stuff. If you want more stuff, I
6 have plenty more I can offer you. I have the traffic study,
7 lighting, I think there was some history of prior approvals
8 on the property, things like that.

9 So, with that, I guess I'll kind of summarize
10 what we submitted. So, we requested a use variance based on
11 the hardship of the property. This is not an instance of a
12 property owner who comes in saying, oh, I want to open a
13 business in my neighborhood, so I'm going to buy the house
14 next door. And then, they buy property that can't be used
15 for what they want to use it for, and they find themselves
16 having a self-imposed hardship and have to come in for a
17 variance.

18 This applicant has been in this from the
19 beginning, they entered into a extension contract and they
20 kind of went through the entire approval process. And, in
21 fact, the expiration is just, they couldn't work fast enough
22 to meet the one year period that is attached to the approval.

23 Just to remind you a little bit about the
24 property. It is very unique. It's a non-conforming lot and
25 is, I believe, less than half the size of lots required by

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

code. It has non-conforming, pre-existing non-conforming conditions with the -- there's no green space in the front. The lot coverage is non-conforming setback, pavement is non-conforming. Those are existing conditions.

We did -- the property is also a landmark. So, the property needs to be repurposed. It is very, very costly to renovate the building for any kind of committed use and we gave you a financial analysis.

The cost of renovating property has only gone up since we were here a few years ago. It definitely has not gone down. The market for office property has not changed. If anything, I would suspect it's probably more vacant space in the market than there used to be.

But, we're happy to answer any questions about any of the financial hardship. That essentially hasn't changed. And again, as I proposed the first time, that hardship runs with the property. It's not personal to anybody, any particular property owner. Anybody who owns this property is going to have to deal with those issues related to the landmark.

I would also remind the Board that other proposals came in before them. There was somebody who came in and wanted to put an addition on the building and the

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

Historic Preservation Commission rejected that. So, we really are a use that is willing and able to use, repurpose this former gas station site. So, that's kind of a summary of the property itself.

I would also note, there is no current storm water management on the site. So, one of the other benefits is to comply with the storm water management regulations that exist today that didn't exist when this site was developed back in the 1920s, if I recall.

So, we requested a use variance, you have the documentation that you made the findings of fact. At the time of the decision you issued a SEQRA determination, findings on all of the variance environmental issues to be considered at the time.

In addition to the use variance granted, the variance to allow a canopy where one would not be allowed. It had previously been a canopy on the site. We went through a lot of historical minutes and documentation of previous efforts to have a canopy on the site, previous existence of canopy on the site, a previous approval for a canopy on the site. And, the Board made findings of fact and granted approval of the canopy.

I believe that you had, through that review

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

process we had reduced and minimized the size of the canopy and also made sure the design of the canopy conformed to their requirements of the Historic Preservation Commission.

We also eliminated and made sure the lighting was minimal with respect to anything that would come up from the canopy.

There are some conditions. There are conditions on the approval, I will get to those in a minute.

The other area variances pertain to the pavement and the existing conditions. One is the setback of the pavement and parking closer to the fire department. And, the other is in the -- I get my directions wrong -- in the corner of the property. I am happy to point those out on a plan if you don't see them. They haven't changed.

If anything, the project is going to improve the physical conditions of the property. We are going to bring -- eliminate one of the non-conforming conditions where the rear setback is also non-conforming. I forgot to mention that. Obviously, we can't change any of the conditions that relate to the existence of the building setback. The building is where it is, that's not going to change.

And we are adding green space and bringing the lot coverage within what code allows, which is currently

1
2
3 noncompliant, so now it is up to code.

4 As far as the approval, the Board put some
5 conditions on the approval. Limited the hours of operation,
6 addressed delivery hours. You know, we are basically asking
7 for re-approval with the same conditions. We are not asking
8 to change anything whatsoever.

9 Essentially, the case law would dictate that
10 if there's no change in the project, no change in the facts,
11 making a decision that would be contrary would simply be
12 arbitrary and capricious.

13 So, I just point out that I think we continue
14 to meet the requirements for the variances, and we're happy
15 to give you more information or answer any questions that you
16 may have.

17 MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Just out of curiosity,
18 when did PEMM purchase the property?

19 MS. BRUGG: A couple months ago.

20 MS. TOMPKINS WRIGHT: Okay, good.

21 MS. BARON: I have a couple questions. So,
22 the new owner 3108 East Avenue LLC is an affiliate of PEMM,
23 as you represented in your application. Can you speak a
24 little bit to their contractual requirements in terms of why
25 they needed to close when they did close the transaction?

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

Did they just run out of ability to extend that contract?

MS. BRUGG: Yeah. The contract, they were running out of time to extend the contract and they had not yet secured all the permits from Department of Transportation, DOH and RG&E.

So, you have to go back to the property for the seller, and then the seller is in the position to negotiate with you. So, they had to go through a negotiation to get an extension to be able to continue to move forward and wrap up the process.

They didn't get site plan approval, until six months after this Board granted approval, so if you realize how quickly the time passes.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Recently they went back to the Historic Preservation Commission?

MS. BRUGG: Yes. And they were granted, is it conditional approvals? Yes, they did approval from the Historic Preservation Commission.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay, very good.

Did you have something else, Lauren?

MS. BARON: Yes. Can you speak a little bit more to the calculations? Why the numbers have not changed since the application was submitted back in 2022 versus the

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

numbers you submitted now in terms of for support of the economic hardship?

MS. BRUGG: So, if anything, the numbers -- they were a co-applicant on the application. So, the numbers they had at the time of the application were a combination of the actual losses of the property owner, as well as the costs that would be incurred by anyone, whether it be property owner or future property owner, anybody else, what is the actual hardship of the property? What would it cost to redevelop the property for a permitted use.

So, we provided construction estimates, we professional opinions of a real estate broker, I believe there were two opinions addressing essentially, that the cost to renovate and improve the property to make it viable for office use would exceed the market value based on the square footage market price for office space. Whether for sale or for rental, we gave you both.

I think everybody knows that the cost of construction has increased. It is kind of like a fairly commonly known fact these days. If you need actual additional information on that, we could provide that but it should be pretty easy to get.

Trying to think what else we provided. So, we

1
2
3 talked a little bit about some of the challenges of the
4 property that contributed to that hardship in terms of the
5 marketability of a parcel of property for an office use on a
6 nonconforming lot next to a firehouse in an area that just is
7 not an office area and how medical use wouldn't go there
8 because it's not a medical office area, those types of
9 things. We provided that data as well.

10 If anything, the hardship has increased to the
11 extent that the factors that have delayed this project have
12 been out of the control of the particular applicant. They
13 have no control over how long the permitting process at the
14 various State and County agencies takes and, you know, they
15 unfortunately had to negotiate, renegotiate their contract
16 because it took everything longer than expected.

17 So, they actually had to pay a significant
18 amount of money to get the extension on the contract. And
19 they have also been paying all the carrying costs for the
20 property during this time. The seller passed on all the
21 carrying costs to them, so they have been paying all the
22 taxes and insurances and maintaining the property.

23 CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay.

24 Are you good, Lauren?

25 MS. BARON: Yes.

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Do you have any?

MR. DiSTEFANO: I'm good.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Anybody over here? We are pretty much looking at the same application. Spent a lot of time on this, as you all know.

MS. BARON: One additional question, obviously the new owner is affiliated with PEMM who previously applied. Did they rely at all on that fact that this Board previously approved the use variances?

MS. BRUGG: Oh, absolutely, yeah. They put a lot into getting that far. They did all the work needed and they certainly did not -- their intent and requirement of the contract is, they secure all municipal approvals including the use variance before acquiring the property.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Okay, very good.

Anything else, Betsy?

MS. BRUGG: No. Happy to answer any questions that come up.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: I think we are good.
Thank you.

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

Yes, sir.

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

JAMES WELLER: Good evening. My name is James Weller. My home for over 50 years has been on Kirk Drive, which is located about 250 yards from the property, 3108 East Avenue.

For over four years I have been the spokesperson for the Kirk-Astor Neighborhood Association, a group of approximately 60 families. My children and the children of this neighborhood do or have attended the Allen Creek School, they have played and fished in the creek and both me and my neighborhoods for years used this facility, both as a fishing station and a candy shop for many years.

Next, I would like to thank you personally for the time and effort you have put into this and all the other applications that you handled.

To begin, I am inclined to support a business plan that starts by restoring an old building, and then offers a limited selection of bread, milk, and eggs and would install a canopy over the gas pumps for the comfort of their customers.

Where I take exception is to the tone of the February 10, 2025, letter from Attorney Brugg to you. When you boiled down her letter, what she is telling you is that this application is a mere formality. There's nothing to see

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

here, get out of our way, get out your rubber stamp to approve it. I see more to your role than that. I see you here to examine the application, to review the site, to identify issues, to ask questions, address the concerns of the residents, and then make a thoughtful decision.

My first question is, do each member of the Board review the minutes from the predecessor 2022-ZBA so you understood what had been considered and the issues at the time and if there's been any material changes since then? I present that question to you.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Yes.

JAMES WELLER: You have all read the application from 2022 and reviewed it?

MR. DiSTEFANO: Yes, it is part of their packet.

JAMES WELLER: Okay. The next big question is that of the environmental impact. This site has a long, long nasty history of pollution. You know the last operator, Kelly Marts, attempted to remediate pollution some 20 years ago by removing the leaky tanks and contaminated soil around the tanks. That was a good start, although that was good enough for a gas station, is it good enough for what you are now proposing? What I don't know is has there been new

1
2
3 pollution in the last 20 years since Kelly Mart started
4 operating?

5 More importantly, what has happened to the
6 pollution behind and underneath the building? For years the
7 gas station operators dumped waste oil into the floor drains
8 and in the service bays, which leached into the soil
9 underneath and behind the building. I am concerned that the
10 proposed use of a former service bay area to store and sell
11 food maybe a grossly contaminated area is inherently unsafe
12 and improper absent of showing there is no new contamination,
13 and the old contamination built up over 100 years of dumping
14 have been removed.

15 Does this Board know from the status of the
16 land underneath the building?

17 I would also inquire as to the condition of
18 the storm drain which had been on the site for many years.
19 That drain dumped directly into Allens Creek which is about
20 100 feet away. With customers pumping their own gas there
21 are more likely to be more spills. Has the service drainage
22 issue been addressed? Is the storm drain still there, that
23 still empties into the creek?

24 Few more things beg an explanation the
25 applicant, and now this is a little technical, so I'm going

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

to a place I am not too sure of. The applicant I am told is 3108 East Avenue LLC. The applicant was formed under the laws of the State of New York on October 24, 2017. The records of the Secretary of State shows this entity was dissolved, it doesn't legally exist on February 5, 2018.

The writ Secretary of State has no records showing this entity is no longer legally exists. I don't understand how something that has not existed for over seven years is bringing this application before you. If they don't exist, they can't be here.

They may also offer the explanation to their client, 3108 East Avenue has standing because they are the owner of the property. Well, maybe they are, maybe they aren't. The records of the Monroe County Clerk show a deed dated January 15th, for Bristol Valley Homes LLC, the previous owner, to 3108 East Avenue LLC. But remember, 3108 East Avenue at the time of the reported transfer had been dissolved for over seven years. How can an entity that didn't exist claim to have the ability to buy and owner real estate.

Lastly, if a resident who has passed in front of the station dealing with it for 50 years, if this facility is opened it's success is conditioned on drawing much more

1
2
3 traffic into this already over congested area. The last
4 grocery store faced the question of increased traffic was the
5 Whole Foods on Monroe Avenue. The experts and town officials
6 tell us not to worry there will be no problem. Ask yourself,
7 does your recent experience mitigate the expert's conclusions
8 there would be little or no impact, or have you experienced a
9 problem with increased traffic on Monroe Avenue?

10 This site is even more difficult than the
11 Monroe Avenue site due to the throttle traffic occasioned by
12 the new bike lanes on East Avenue and the inherent problems
13 of having a school within 100 yards and south the fire
14 department 100 feet to the north.

15 At best, cars seeking fuel and groceries
16 during the morning and evening rush hours will be challenged
17 by children waling to and from the school and in front of the
18 station, school busses entering and leaving the nearby
19 schoolyard, increase the fire trucks demanding right of way
20 during the rush hours, and the traffic engineering which
21 draws vehicles to this area as they enter Route 441 and 490.
22 I think this is just a little bit more traffic, it will be a
23 little too much traffic.

24 Now, I placed several issues before you and
25 they are important questions about real issues which impact

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

our neighborhood and that part of the town. These issues require well considered answers. My neighborhood and the town deserve something better than what was requested of you to rubber stamp. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MIETZ: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak regarding this application? The Public Hearing is closed.

* * *

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

REPORTER CERTIFICATE

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

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

Dated this 20th day of April, 2025.

At Rochester, New York

R h o d a C o l l i n s
Rhoda Collins

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

BRIGHTON

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING

DELIBERATIONS

MARCH 5th, 2025
at approximately 8:07 p.m.
Brighton Town Hall
2300 Elmwood Avenue
Rochester, New York 14618

PRESENT:

DENNIS MIETZ, Chairperson

MATTHEW D'AUGUSTINE)	
HEATHER McKAY-DRURY)	
EDWARD F. PREMO, II)	BOARD MEMBERS
JUDY SCHWARTZ)	
ANDREA TOMPKINS WRIGHT)	

LAUREN BARON, ESQ.
Town Attorney

RICK DiSTEFANO
Senior Planner

NOT PRESENT:
KATHLEEN SCHMITT

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

REPORTED BY: Rhoda Collins, Court Reporter
FORBES COURT REPORTING SERVICES, LLC
21 Woodcrest Drive
Batavia, New York 14020

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

APPLICATION 3A-01-25

3A-01-25 Application of Kirk Wright, Sign and Lighting Services LLC, agent, and CRE JV Mixed Five New York 4 (Citizens Bank), owner of property located at 2000 Monroe Avenue, for a Sign Variance from Section 207-32 to allow for the installation of a freestanding sign where not allowed by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

Motion made by Ms. Tompkins Wright to deny Application 3A-01-25 based on testimony given and documents presented and the following findings and facts.

FINDINGS AND FACTS:

1. The requested variance is substantial given that monument sign is not committed in the zone and the requested monument sign is six feet in height.

2. Applicant did not present sufficient evidence that no other alternative can alleviate the difficulty or produce the desired result and thus it is not the minimum necessary required by the applicant.

3. Given the very few monument signs along Monroe Avenue, applicant did not present sufficient evidence that no unacceptable change in the character of the neighborhood would occur.

(Second by Ms. McKay-Drury)

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

(Mr. Premo, yes; Ms. Schwartz, yes;
Mr. D'Augustine, no; Mr. Mietz, yes; Ms. McKay-Drury, yes;
Ms. Tompkins Wright, yes.)

(Upon roll call, motion to deny carries.)

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

APPLICATION 3A-02-25

Application of Serge Tsvasman, agent, and Paul Henry, owner of property located at 482 Antlers Drive, for an Area Variance from Section 205-2 to allow the reconstruction of an attached garage and construction of a building addition to extend 1.5 ft. Into the 12.75 ft. Side setback required by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

Motion made by Mr. Mietz to approve Application 3A-02-25 based on the following findings and facts.

FINDINGS AND FACTS:

1. The variance request is the minimum to meet the needs of the applicant.
2. The request is not significant at 1.5 feet into the 12.75 side setback.
3. Other homes in the neighborhood have similar encroachments to the narrowness of the lots.

CONDITIONS:

1. The variance is valid only, based on the drawings submitted and testimony given.
2. All necessary Architectural Review Board and building permits shall be obtained.

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

(Second by Mr. D'Augustine.)

(Ms. McKay-Drury, yes; Ms. Tompkins Wright, yes; Ms. Schwartz, yes; Mr. Premo, yes; Mr. D'Augustine, yes; Mr. Mietz, yes.)

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

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

APPLICATION 3A-03-25

3A-03-25 Application of Jack Savage, Passero Associates, agent, and the University of Rochester, owner of property located at 250 East River Road, for renewal of a Temporary and Revocable Use Permit (7A-06-23) pursuant to Section 219-4 to allow a new mobile PET/CT scanner (trailer) to be on site until April 30, 2026. All as described an application and plans on file.

(Ms. Tompkins-Wright left the room as she has recused herself from this.)

Motion made by Ms. Schwartz to approve Application 3A-03-25 based on the following findings and facts.

FINDINGS AND FACTS:

1. This variance is for the renewal of a temporary and revokable use permit that has been granted without incident for many years, specifically since 2020.
2. Approval of the variance will allow the U of R to place a new mobile PET/CT scanner trailer on the site until August 31, 2026. It will be placed on the existing concrete pad.
3. This trailer will house the medical equipment necessary to continue providing medical services until a permanent

facility is completed which will house updated technology.

4. There will be no adverse effect on the health, safety or welfare of the community. This temporary revocable use permit is the same as the one granted many times with no changes to the request.

5. All conditions and safeguards previously required as a part of the prior temporary revokable permit have been complied with.

CONDITIONS:

1. This variance only applies to testimony presented and in the written applicant.

2. All building and planning approvals must be obtained.

3. This variance is granted through August 31, 2026.

(Second by Ms. McKay-Drury.)

(Mr. Mietz, yes; Mr. D'Augustine, yes;
Mr. Premo, yes; Ms. McKay-Drury, yes; Ms. Schwartz, yes.)

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

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

APPLICATION OF 3A-04-25

3A-04-25 Application of Betsy Brugg, Woods Oviatt Gilman LLP, agent, and 3108 East Avenue LLC, owner of property located at 3108 East Avenue, for a Use Variance from Section 203-44 to allow a gas station with convenience store to be located in a BE-1 Office and Office Park District where not allowed by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

APPLICATION 3A-05-25

Application of Betsy Brugg, Woods Oviatt Gilman LLP, agent, and 3108 East Avenue LLC, owner of property located at 3108 East Avenue, for Area Variances from Section 205-18 to 1) allow parking of vehicles to within 2 ft. Of a side lot line (north) where a 10 ft. Setback is required by code, and 2) to allow paved areas / drive aisles up to the front lot line where a 20 ft. Setback is required by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

APPLICATION 3A-06-25

3A-06-25 Application of Betsy Brugg, Woods Oviatt Gilman LLP, agent, and 3108 East Avenue LLC, owner of property located at 3108 East Avenue, for an Area Variance from Section 207-6B to allow an accessory structure (gas pump canopy) to be located in a front yard in lieu of the rear

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

yard as required by code. All as described on application and plans on file.

(Mr. Premo left the room as he has recused himself from this.)

Motion made by Ms. McKay-Drury to table and reopen the Public Hearing with respect to Applications 3A-04-25, 3A-05-25, and 3A-06-25 for further information, such as, but not limited to, and updated information supporting the hardship criteria for the use variance, as well as the environmental condition of the property, and also what permits have been obtained to date.

(Second by Mr. D'Augustine.)

(Ms. Schwartz, yes; Ms. Tompkins Wright, yes; Mr. Mietz, yes; Mr. D'Augustine, yes; Ms. McKay-Drury, yes.)

(Upon roll call, motion to table the applications and leave the Public Hearing open is approved.)

* * *

BRIGHTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS 03/05/2025

REPORTER CERTIFICATE

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

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

Dated this 20th day of April, 2025.

At Rochester, New York

R h o d a C o l l i n s
Rhoda Collins