

**Pittsford Planning Commission (PC) Public Hearing Minutes  
June 24, 2021**

**Board Members Present:** Mark Winslow (Chair), Kevin Blow (vice-Chair), Rick Conway, Mark Pape, Chuck Charbonneau, Derek Blow, Robb Spensley, Mike Norris. Board Member Absent: Tom Markowski

**Others Present for Application 21-27:** Jeff Biasuzzi (Zoning Administrator -ZA),

**Others Present Via Zoom:** Micheline Moncur (Applicant) , Margaret Rawlings (abutting owner), Alicia Malay (resident) Perter & Donna Wilson (resident)

**1. Call to Order – Action Signs, Zaremba Group LLC (Owner) *Hearing -Application 21-27***

This Public Hearing was called to order at 8:00 pm by Chairman Mark Winslow. It was electronically recorded by Zoom, and cassette tape.

The PC Members introduced themselves. Upon request, no Members identified having any Conflict of Interest or ex-parte communications on this application.

M. Winslow discussed the Hearing's rules and procedure.

The Interested Parties identified were M. Moncour, and Jeffrey Biasuzzi , who were sworn in.

The ZA was asked to present the details of Application 21-27, which requests approval for one flush mounted, and one free-standing (pylon mounted) two-sided sign. Both signs are to be externally illuminated with downlit LED fixtures. The signs advertise the Dollar General store under construction at 40 Plains Road.

The Chairman asked the Members if there were questions for the ZA.

R. Conway asked for details on the flush mounted sign and the lighting fixtures.

R. Spensley asked if the Pylon sign was located on the side or front side of the property. The ZA replied that the entrance to the property was on Plains Road, and this was the property's front.line. Therefore, the pylon sign was sited on the front setback and should be setback 30 feet from the center line of the Town road.

R. Conway asked if the pylon sign was within the Right of way for VT Rt. 7. The ZA stated it was not, and referred to the Site Plan submitted, which delineated both road's R.o.Ws.

R. Spensley asked if the pylon sign would exceed the maximum regulated height of 15 feet above the grade of Plains Road. The ZA stated (from his interpretation of the mapped elevations on the application site plan) that the sign's height would be compliant with the rule.

M. Norris asked if Zoning regulations addressed levels of illumination permitted. The ZA stated the regulations did not include specifications, and that the issue was for the PC to set

conditions on. the ZA suggested Members view the Townline Equipment pylon sign on VT Rt. 7, as a reasonable example of the type and placement of the sign being requested.

R. Conway noted that the PC's jurisdiction is only on the Town rules, and that VTRANS has its own restriction on signs along state highways.

M. Winslow asked members if there were additional questions for the ZA. Hearing none, he asked for the Applicant to submit any additional information.

Micheline Moncur of Action Sign Company discussed that larger signs had been preferred, but they were reduced

P 2 of 2 pgs. Pittsford PC Hearing Minutes – Application 21-27 Action Sign Co. & Zarembba Group 6/24/2021

to accommodate Zoning regulations. The pylon mounted sign measures 3' X 6' and is to have a height of seven (70 feet from top of ground.

R. Spensley asked if Zoning included other regulations in addition to Sections 901 & 902. The ZA stated there were not. M. Norris discussed the signs design and size. R. Conway asked for confirmation that the pylon sign was to be 3' X 6' X 7' high. M. Moncur confirmed.

M. Winslow asked the Members for further question to the Applicant. Hearing none, He asked if any persons or parties of interest to submit questions and comments on Application 21-27.

Margaret "Peggy" Rawlins asked how bright the sign's lighting would be, and how far away the lighting may go on the property. M. Moncur responded that the design of the down-lit LED gooseneck light fixture directed the light only to the sign's face. M. Rawlings asked if the signs needed to be illuminated, noting that building was quite large and would have a sign over the entrance. M. Moncur replied that the objective of a sign is to be visible, and that the two-sided pylon sign could be viewed from both directions on Rt. 7. Illumination was needed in order to be seen in the evenings. It was noted that the flush mounted sign only faced north and would be difficult for persons traveling Rt. 7 to see.

R. Spensley, referring to the Zoning Definitions for Signs, asked if the dimensions of the sign, its support structure and thickness had been considered. R. Conway stated that the PC's jurisdiction in this application was on Section 902, the sign's illumination.

M. Winslow asked if other persons had any input. M. Rawlings asked if the gooseneck light fixtures would affect the tenants in her house located south of the future store. Action Signs stated that the lighting would not be directed to anyplace but the face of the sign, and the fixtures can be adjusted to maintain this area of illumination.

M. Norris stated that Act 250 would routinely review any lighting issues that would impact the area, and that this was likely considered in its approval of the project.

Alicia Malay asked if the PC had the most recent landscape plans, a result of an Environmental Court Stipulation Agreement. Her concern was that the revised landscape plan may impact the sign's location. The ZA was uncertain as to the answer, and would have to research the answer.

D. Wilson asked the sign was at all internally illuminated. M. Moncur stated there was no internal illumination . She also expressed concern that drivers may be impacted by glare.

M. Winslow asked for any further comments. Hearing none he requested a Motion to end the comment session.and move on to PC Member discussion. K. Blow so moved, M. Pape seconded, all approved and Motion passed.

M. Winslow stated his opinion that PC Members lacked information on the level of illumination (lumens), the Act 250 permit approved, the final landscape plan, and any participation from a property Owner. Following further discussion, R. Conway recommended recessing the Hearing to a future date, time & place determined Upon Chair's request for a Motion, M. .Pape Moved to to recess the hearing to Thursday July 15th at 7:00 pm at Town Offices and vis Zoom. The Applicant is to provide information on the lighting specifications, present the approved Act 250 permit and revised Landscape plan, and arrange for a property Owner to participate. D. Blow seconded the Motion, all approved and Motion passed.

R. Conway Moved to recess the Meeting, D. Blow seconded, all approved and the Meeting ended at 9:00pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jeffrey Biasuzzi  
Approved \_\_\_\_\_