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I. INTRODUCTION

This document and the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) for the draft of Envision Brighton Comprehensive Plan 2028, dated July 11, 2018 and included here by reference, form the Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement (FGEIS) for the proposed plan. A record of all pertinent State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) documents and notifications are contained in Appendix 1.

The purpose of the FGEIS is to incorporate all comments received on the DGEIS during the comment period between July 7/11/18, 2018 and August 13, 2018 and to provide responses to those comments. The FGEIS provides additional information and analysis in response to the comments and questions received on the DGEIS and the Comprehensive Plan 2028. Written comments on the DGEIS and Comprehensive Plan 2028 were received from the general public at a Public Open House held on August 2, 2018, and following the open house until August 13, 2018, and are provided in Appendix 2.

The intent of the FGEIS is to address comments as sufficiently and specifically as possible given the current information developed in the review process to date.

Following its review of the draft Envision Brighton Comprehensive Plan 2028 and DGEIS, the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee proposed certain amendments to the draft plan. These proposed amendments are contained in Section II, Additional Information. A discussion of the environmental impacts of the proposed amendments is also included in Section II.

Section III of the FGEIS serves as the Lead Agency’s response to the written comments received on the Comprehensive Plan and DGEIS.

Section IV of the FGEIS, Conclusion, verifies that the DGEIS and the FGEIS were completed in accordance with the requirements of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act and its implementing regulations found at 6NYCRR, Part 617.
II. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Proposed Amendments to the Draft Envision Brighton Comprehensive Plan 2028

The following amendments to the draft of Envision Brighton Comprehensive Plan 2028 address comments made on the draft plan or clarify/correct sections of the plan. The potential environmental impacts of the proposed amendments are addressed at the end of the section.

Amendment 1: Amends “Buckland Park Master Plan” – Recommendations (Volume 2, Page 48) to add recommendations #12 and #13 to address access to Barclay Square Drive and to provide provisions for safely crossing Westfall Road, respectively.

Amendment 2: Amends “Brighton Winter Farmers Market Site Plan” - Map 10 (Volume 1, Page 51) to correct the “Proposed Site Improvements” - #1 to say “Brickyard Trail” instead of “Proposed Brickyard Trail.”

Amendment 3: Amends “Public Health and Safety Policy Statement” – Recommendation #12 (Volume 2, Page 22) to emphasize the fact that the Town already does include maintenance and replacement provisions in its annual budget for infrastructure assets.

Amendment 4: Amends “Existing Land Use” – Map 14 (Volume 1, Page 53) to reduce the parcel line weights on the map such that the color of the residential areas does not get confused with the parcel lines themselves. The parcel lines are grey, while the underlying residential land use is yellow.

Amendment 5: Amends “Town Boards and Commissions” – list (Volume 2, Page 5) to include Town Board.

Amendment 6: Amends “Land Use Classifications” – introductory paragraph (Volume 2, Page 26) to emphasize that the classifications are not the same as the Town’s current zoning districts, but rather reflect general types of proposed land use.

Amendment 7: Amends “Incentive Zoning as a Planning Tool – last sentence 2nd paragraph (Volume 2, Page 29) to replace “The Town and the application negotiate community amenities to mitigate those impacts.” with “To offset the impact of these incentives, the applicant offers offsetting community amenities.”

Amendment 8: Amends “Land Use Map” – land use (Volumes 1 and 3, Figure 14), to correct various parcels with appropriate land use designation.

Amendment 9: Amends “Map 5” (Volume 2, Page 37) to show that the Town is in the process of acquiring additional park land.

Amendment 10: Amends “Neighborhood Commercial/Mixed Use” (Volume 2, Page 28) to delete reference to Garden Apartments and emphasize the allowance of complementary residential development on the second and third floors of building where permitted commercial uses are on the first/ground floor.
Environmental Impact of Proposed Amendments
None of the amendments made to the Draft Envision Brighton Comprehensive Plan 2028 or DGEIS will have an adverse impact on the environment.
III. RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

This chapter serves as the Lead Agency’s response to the written comments received on the Comprehensive Plan and DGEIS. These comments and responses are summarized below.

Written Comments Received from Public Open House August 2, 2018

1. Comment:
Love the fact that Town provides leaf collection, but concerned over amount of energy (equipment and manpower) needed to do it. Is there a way to reduce impact without losing the service?

Response:
The Comprehensive Plan does address those recommendations, please refer to Volume 2, Page 8, and Recommendation #15. The Town continues to consider ways to provide efficient services while conserving energy and manpower including leaf collection.

2. Comment:
I am interested in town-wide internet access. What taxpayers save in personal monthly costs can be put towards town-wide access.

Response:
Comment acknowledged. Please refer to Objective A under Public Health and Safety Policy Statement in the Comprehensive Plan (Volume 2, Page 20) and other key objectives of the Plan.

3. Comment:
Consider a “blue box” or some other security device for the trail that extends into Buckland property to Senator Keating Blvd. – kind of isolated from population, at least until further development.

Response:
Comment acknowledged. The Comprehensive Plan includes recommendations for the Town to continue to consider safety provisions for all public trail facilities. Please refer to Objective C (Volume 2, Page 20).

4. Comment:
I think more should be invested into a community center. Brighton Rec facilities are less than stellar. Community rooms for rent, classroom space, summer camps, community pool (?), dance or performance space...

Response:
Comment acknowledged. Investment in a new community center facility is one of several key considerations proposed in the Buckland Park Master Plan. Please refer to Volume 2, Pages 48 through 53.

5. Comment:
East Zone: 44 Acres – Community Farm and Eco Green House for year-round community gardening and HS research studies and outreach.
Response:
Comment Acknowledged. A community farm is one of several recommendations made in the Buckland Park Master Plan. Please refer to Volume 2, Pages 48 through 53. Consideration of an eco green house could be included in future planning phase discussions.

6. Comment:
Community composting site – vermi composting establishment to convert compost into topsoil and fertilizer.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. As previously noted, a community farm is one of several recommendations made in the Buckland Park Master Plan. Please refer to Volume 2, Pages 48 through 53. Consideration of a community composting site could be included in future planning phase discussions.

7. Comment:
I love the new sidewalks along Monroe Ave. with the plants absorbing rainwater and buffer from traffic.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. Please refer to the Monroe Avenue Green Innovation Grant Program (GIGP) Project on Volume 2, Page 32.

8. Comment:
I agree with the plan for mixed age housing. Many elderly are lonely in senior living facilities. Young families could benefit from surrogate grandparents, neighbors interested in young people.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. Please refer to Volume 2, Page 12, Objective E, and Page 13, Recommendations #2 and #3.

9. Comment:
Affordable housing is also very important to allow our young couples to settle in town, especially those carrying large college loan debts.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. Please refer to Volume 2, Page 12, Objective C, and Page 13, Recommendations #2 and #3.

10. Comment:
We need to link the neighborhoods to the major arteries. There needs to be safe pedestrian/bike access to the major roadways.
Response:

11. Comment:
Excellent Plan.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged.

12. Comment:
Given the school buildings having been expanded yet still at maximum capacity, we should be cognizant of residential development, especially high density apartments like Briar Manor.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. Please refer to Volume 2, Page 12, Objectives C, D and F.

13. Comment:
Brighton Henrietta Road area should focus on light commercial development (environmentally sensitive). I also have concerns for development of Farash property on French Road. I recognize it is privately owned, but still...

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. Please see the focus area for Brighton Henrietta Town Line Road, Volume 2, Page 21, Recommendations #1 and 2. The Farash property is designated as low density residential, consistent with its current low density zoning.

Other Written Comments Received:

14. Comment:
The Envision Brighton plan should consider including maps comparing the proposed land use classifications and zoning maps to existing classifications.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. The draft plan includes an existing zoning map, and a description of existing land uses based on the New York State Real Property Tax records, which are obtained from Monroe County and the Town of Brighton.

15. Comment:
A green connection to connect the Central Green on both sides of 590 should be considered as part of this plan.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. Please refer to Volume 2, Page 38, Recommendation #8.
16. Comment:
The South Winton / Westfall property is marked as residential with transition to mixed use. The Comprehensive Plan should consider labeling this property differently as the Town intends to purchase a portion of this parcel for park land.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. Map 5 has been revised to show that the Town is in the process of acquiring additional park land. Please refer to Volume 2, Page 37, Map 5.

17. Comment:
The Sustainability Oversight Committee recommends ten-foot vehicle lanes and five-foot bike lanes for the Senator Keating Blvd extension rather than the proposed eleven foot vehicle lanes and four foot bike lanes.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. The illustration shown in Volume 2 on Page 53, is for conceptual purposes only. The Final design of Senator Keating Boulevard has not been prepared. The width of travel and bike lanes will be determined at the time of final design. Also, please refer to Volume 2, Page 21, Recommendation #6 regarding the adoption of a Complete Street Policy.

18. Comment:
Given the source of funding for the Plan, I understand the focus on sustainability. That being said, however, what seems lacking are the particulars of economic feasibility of this type of development and redevelopment. What are the realities of purchase, demolition and redevelopment? Some input from the development community would be most helpful.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. Please refer to Volume 2, Page 13, #’s 4 and 5. At the time form based code dimensional regulations are considered in the future, the Town will consult with the development community for input.

19. Comment:
I also note the height restrictions recommended along Monroe Avenue and am not clear on this rationale. Existing properties may already exceed these limits.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. When implementing recommendations #4 and #5 in Volume 2, Pages 32 & 34, a detailed analysis of zoning regulations will be conducted.

20. Comment:
Land use Figure 14 (and others). I am not clear on the location of apartment complexes. On Figure 14, they are included in commercial use. Are they differentiated elsewhere? Is there any pattern of these uses that need to be accommodated?
Response:
Comment Acknowledged. The Land Use Map is based on New York State Real Property Tax codes, from which apartments are considered commercial. The map is intended to show general existing land uses per the NYS Real Property Tax Codes.

21. Comment:
Similarly, location of residential facilities for Seniors would be helpful with differentiation of skilled nursing/assisted independent. Townhomes targeted for senior/empty nesters is very popular and growing. The ability to locate them visually would be of help.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. This would be outside the scope of the Comprehensive Plan process. When senior facilities are proposed, developers should provide specific locations of existing facilities.

22. Comment:
Perhaps Senior and Apartment uses could be on their own map to see how they are distributed around town.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. This would be outside the scope of the Comprehensive Plan process. When these type of facilities are proposed, developers should provide specific locations of existing facilities.

22. Comment:
Generally, are there separate overlays available for all uses to compare dispersion of different uses?

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. Separate overlays are not available at this time.

23. Comment:
As discussed, why are Garden Apartments singled out and to be prohibited?

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. Please refer to revisions made in Volume 2, Page 28. Reference to Garden Apartments have been deleted to and emphasize the allowance of complementary residential development on the second and third floors of building where permitted commercial uses are on the first/ground floor.

24. Comment:
Westfall/Winton:
I note the suggestion of Residential to Mixed use transition. This seems appropriate in general but how does the group see this playing out? This is very flat land and all uses would seem to be very visible. The proposals for this property all seem to be looking at larger buildings for commercial or higher density residential. What is feasible economically given land purchase and development costs? Again, developer input would be helpful.
Response:
Comment Acknowledged. Please refer to Volume 2, Page 36, Recommendation #1. When development is proposed in this area, a Market Study should be prepared by the applicant and submitted to the Town to verify the feasibility of the project.

25. Comment:
“Throughout this document it is stated that the town should save whatever open space is left in the town, including the remainder of the Faith Temple land. On one hand it states that there should be no more development of open space and we should ‘leave green space.’ But a few lines later it states that Incentive Zoning should be used as a means of acquiring open space. Under Core Values it states ‘Conserve existing open space by promoting redevelopment of vacant, underutilized and obsolete commercial properties.’ Which is it, save open space of let it be developed?”

Response:
Comment acknowledged. The Vision Statement in Volume 2, Page 3 does state that one of the commitments that the town will make to the Brighton community will be to: “Preserve and protect our environmental assets.” The plan further promotes the preservation of open space areas in other sections of the plan, such as Objective A of the Environmental Policy Statement, (Volume 2, Page 6), which states: “Preserve, in their natural state, open space areas that have significant ecological value, and sensitive environmental areas, including wetlands, floodplains, watercourses, woodlots, steep slopes, and wildlife habitats.”
A statement that there should be no more development of open space was not found in the plan documents.
While a section entitled “Core Values” was not found, Volume 2, Page 16, Objective F in the Economic Vitality Policy section does state: “Conserve existing open space by promoting redevelopment of vacant, underutilized and obsolete commercial properties to enhance the Monroe Avenue and West Henrietta Road corridors.”

26. Comment (paraphrased):
Stating that Persimmon Park is “ideal for picnicking” (Volume1, Page26) is not realistic given the location of the park and its existing amenities.

Response:
Comment acknowledged.

27. Comment:
“Who will the town be collaborating and cooperating with on the Buckland Park Master Plan? Will the citizens have any say in this or will it be just the developer?”

Response:
As a public park, the town will be the developer, and the collaboration and cooperation will be with Brighton citizens and stakeholders (recreation department, sports teams, farmer’s market, neighborhood associations, etc.)
28. Comment:
“It is stated that Brighton has a large senior population and this should be considered in future housing plans. All of these are very large and take up lots of land. Have you surveyed seniors and their families as to what they would desire? Brighton already has at least seven large assisted living facilities. Do we really need more?”

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. Consideration in future housing plans does not necessarily mean multi-unit development. It also includes strategies to allow seniors to age in place in their existing homes or apartments. Please refer to Volume 2, Page 12, Objective E.

29. Comment:
“I would like to see pictures of and have a more in-depth explanation of ‘form-based codes.’ You say it would be used in conjunction with Incentive Zoning. What does that mean? How can you have two very different types of zoning in place for one property?”

Response:
Comment acknowledged. More information on form-based codes will be presented when their implementation is considered in the future. Form based codes and Incentive Zoning are two different concepts of land use control, which can be used either together or separately as a particular situation warrants.

30. Comment (paraphrased):
Nothing was seen about future use of CCA (Community Choice Aggregation), solar energy or wind power. The town brags that we are the first town around to pass the CCA concept, yet is dragging its feet on getting an Administrator to start the process. “Are we going to move forward with this process?”

Response:
Comment acknowledged. The question is outside of the scope of the Comprehensive Plan process.

31. Comment:
“Some other opportunities to consider for the remaining open space to the south west of Buckland Park or south of 590 would be a solar farm. The further south one goes, the less any residents will be impacted by this. When walking on the trails adjacent to the Erie Canal it is always windy! That would be a place to consider a few wind turbines.”

Response:
Comment acknowledged.

32. Comment (paraphrased):
Encouraged by the inclusion of conservation, connection & sustainability in the plan, but disappointed by map showing Senator Keating Boulevard and a “large land use designation for yet more office.”
Response:

Regarding the “designation for yet more office,” the plan does recommend Office, Retail, and/or Commercial Higher Intensity in central Brighton between I-590 and the existing/proposed Senator Keating Boulevard (Volume 2, Page 37, Map 5, Westfall Road Focus Area) in conjunction with a Master Plan for the area to maintain and preserve “some of the area’s more critical and pronounced open spaces, while enhancing the Town tax base through well planned development to provide services for residents and visitors.” (Volume 2, Page 36, “Recommendations,” First Paragraph). It also notes that the town is in the process of acquiring an additional 26 acre parcel in the area to expand Buckland Park.

33. Comment (paraphrased): A “renewable energy” land use designation should be considered for Westfall Road and Winton Road in lieu of more office and office parks which are diametrically opposed to any form of conservation and sustainability, and of which there is already too much. There is a way for the land to be obtained. Solar panels would be a good use of the Westfall Road/Winton Road area.

Response:
Comment Acknowledged.

34. Comment (paraphrased):
Incentive Zoning should not be used, and has been used in a backwards fashion: if it is used, the town should dictate the amenities desired and calculate the value of the incentives to be allowed.
Response:
Comment acknowledged. The Town Board has the authority to determine the relative value of incentives requested and amenities offered. The specific incentives and amenities allowed are specified in the Code of the Town of Brighton, Chapter 209.

35. Comment (paraphrased): There should be a lot more thinking out of the box, because there is a lot of the same old, same old. Lofty goals have often been stated in the past, but not implemented.

Response:
Comment acknowledged. Envision Brighton was one of the first comprehensive plans in the state to be developed with a focus on sustainability. For that reason, the work on the plan did involve considerable thinking outside of the box compared to most comprehensive plan processes. It also varied from the traditional comprehensive planning box by considering the use of Form Based Zoning.

36. Comment (paraphrased): Statements on the first page of the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement talk about development as well as environmental sustainability, and you can’t have it both ways. Development, as the plan imagines it, will win out and the residents and environment will suffer, and already have. “Though it sounds good that the plan is viewed as a mitigation measure against the prospective impact of development on environmental resources . . . . You must admit that we should not have to mitigate any more impacts on our town.” The time has come, and gone in a way, to think and act differently.
Comment acknowledged. The plan recognizes that it is important to provide a balance between development and other community goals, including environmental goals. See the Economic Vitality Policy Statement in Volume 2, Page 16.

37. Comment: “We have lived in our home for just about 50 years. It would be wonderful to see in our lifetime, evidence of a real transformation of how and what we do in our town to really be sustainable and conserve the environment. We want something left for our children and five grandchildren.”

Response:
Comment acknowledged. Envision Brighton should provide a solid step in the direction of sustainability, but more important than anything that’s written is the long-established and continuing involvement of Brighton’s residents in this Plan and other plans past and future.

38. Comment:
“p. 22 - Recommendation #12 is to ‘develop an Asset Management Plan that insures proper replacement and protection of existing infrastructure assets.’ The town already has a sidewalk and road replacement plan, as well as sewer relining, that we budget for every year. This recommendation makes it sound like we have no maintenance/replacement plan in place. Would it be a more accurate recommendation that we, say, ‘work to continually improve the town’s asset management plan’ or that we ‘formalize the town’s current replacement cycle into an Asset Management Plan?’”

Response:
Comment acknowledged. Please refer to Volume 2, Page 22, Recommendation 12 for revised language addressing this comment.

39. Comment:
“p. 51 – Map 10 – the reference to marker #1 is ‘proposed Brickyard Trail.’ Should this be changed to simply reference ‘Brickyard Trail’ since it is currently in existence and not ‘proposed’ and longer?

Response:
Comment acknowledged. Please refer to Volume 2, Page 51, Map 10 for revised reference marker addressing this comment.

40. Comment:
“p. 53 – the map may be confusing. Residential areas should be color-coded as yellow, but they appear gray. Perhaps this is because the map shows parcel lines, and given the size of the map, small residential parcel lines overpower the yellow background? Ca the map be revised?”

Response:
Comment acknowledged. Please refer to Volume 1, Page 53, Map 14 - Existing Land Use. The line weights of the parcel lines on the map have been revised to better show the yellow zoning color.
41. Comment:
“Have we/can we consider restriction of so-called ‘pig snout’ residential construction where the primary frontal view of the residence/townhome etc. is a 2 car garage door?”

Response:
Comment Acknowledged. This would be outside the scope of the Comprehensive Plan process.
IV. CONCLUSION

The DGEIS and the FGEIS prepared for Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan were completed in accordance with the requirements of the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act and its implementing regulations found at 6NYCRR, Par
APPENDIX 1

SEQR DOCUMENTATION
NOTICE OF COMPLETION OF A DRAFT GENERIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
Prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law

SEQRA Classification: Type 1
Project: Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan
          Town of Brighton Project #ER-6-18
Lead Agency: Town of Brighton Town Board
            2300 Elmwood Avenue, Rochester, NY 14618
Written Public Comment Period Ends: August 13, 2018 at 5:00 PM
Copies of Draft GEIS Available at: Town of Brighton Town Hall,
            2300 Elmwood Avenue,
            Town Web Site: www.townofbrighton.org

Contact: Ramsey A. Boehner, Town of Brighton Environmental Review Liaison Officer
          2300 Elmwood Avenue, Rochester, NY 14618
          585-784-5229
          ramsey.boehner@townofbrighton.org

Re: Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement
    Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan
    Town of Brighton Project #ER-6-18

Dear Involved or Interested Agencies:

The Town Board of the Town of Brighton, as Lead Agency for State Environmental Quality Review for the Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan (the Plan), has accepted as complete the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) for the project. Written comments on the DGEIS will be accepted until 5:00 PM on August 13, 2018.

A DVD with a copy of the Draft Plan and the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement is enclosed.

The action involved is the adoption of Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan, an update to the Town of Brighton Comprehensive Plan. When and if adopted, the Plan will provide the legal basis for developing and implementing land use regulations for the town and will serve as a guide for both public and private decisions that will influence the Town of Brighton community in the future.
The Draft of the Plan and the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement are available for review on the Town of Brighton website: http://www.townofbrighton.org/, and also at the Town of Brighton Building & Planning Department at 2300 Elmwood Avenue in Brighton, NY 12148.

Sincerely yours,

Ramsey A. Boehner
Environmental Review Liaison Officer
EXHIBIT NO 19

At a Town Board Meeting of the Town of Brighton, Monroe County, New York, held at the Brighton Town Hall, 2300 Elmwood Avenue, in said Town of Brighton on the 11th day of July, 2018.

Present:

WILLIAM W. NOHLE, Supervisor

JAMES R. VOGEL
CHRISTOPHER K. WERNER
JASON S. DIFONZIO
ROBIN R. WILT

Council Members

BE IT RESOLVED, that correspondence dated July 6, 2018 from Environmental Review Liaison Officer Ramsey A. Seehafer along with a draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement prepared pursuant to SEQRA regarding the Town’s Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan, be received and filed; and further

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Town Board declares itself to be the lead agency for the environmental review of the Plan under SEQRA and hereby accepts the DGEIS as complete and adequate for public review and comment and sets August 13, 2018 at 5:00 pm as the deadline for written comments on the DGEIS pursuant to SEQRA.

Dated: July 11, 2018

William W. Nohle, Supervisor Voting

James R. Vogel, Councilmember Voting

Christopher K. Werner, Councilmember Voting

Jason S. Difonzo, Councilmember Voting

Robin R. Wilt, Councilmember Voting

 образом: Z-15-3
APPENDIX 2
WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED
Hi Ramsey:

The DGEIS looks good to me and I think it is an excellent roadmap of the substance of the comp plan documents. I just have a couple of comments on the other documents as follows:

**Vision Development**

p. 22 – Recommendation #12 is to “develop an Asset Management Plan that insures proper replacement and protection of existing infrastructure assets.” The town already has a sidewalk and road replacement plan, as well as sewer relining, that we budget for every year. This recommendation makes it sound like we have no maintenance/replacement plan in place. Would it be a more accurate recommendation that we, say, “work to continually improve the town’s asset management plan” or that we “formalize the town’s current replacement cycle into an Asset Management Plan?”

p. 51 – Map 10 – the reference to marker #1 is “proposed Brickyard Trail.” Should this be changed to simply reference “Brickyard Trail” since it is currently in existence and not “proposed” any longer?

**Existing Conditions**

p. 53 – the map may be confusing. Residential areas should be color-coded as yellow, but they appear gray. Perhaps this is because the map shows parcel lines, and given the size of the map, small residential parcel lines overpower the yellow background? Can the map be revised?

Enjoy your weekend!

---

**JASON S. DIPONZIO**

**ATTORNEY AT LAW**

950 Reynolds Arcade Building • 16 East Main Street • Rochester, NY 14614
P: (585) 530-8515 Ext. 104 • F: (585) 530-8518
Email: jdiponzio@diponziolaw.com
Website: www.diponziolaw.com

The information in this transmittal (including attachments, if any) is from a law office, and may be privileged, confidential and subject to attorney work product protection. Any review, use, disclosure, distribution or copying of this transmittal is prohibited except on behalf of the intended recipient. If you have received this message in error, please notify me immediately by reply email and destroy all copies of the transmittal. Thank you.
August 13, 2018

Ramsey Boehner, Town Planner
Town of Brighton
2300 Elmwood Ave.
Rochester, New York 14618

Re: Comprehensive Plan Update
Envision Brighton: Draft Plan Comments

Dear Mr. Boehner:

The SOC would like to thank you for the opportunity to review the Envision Brighton Comprehensive Plan Documents. We offer the following comments for your consideration:

- The Envision Brighton plan should consider including maps comparing the proposed land use classifications and zoning maps to existing classifications.
- A green connection to connect the Central Green on both sides of 590 should be considered as part of this plan.
- The South Winton / Westfall property is marked as residential with transition to mixed use. The Comprehensive Plan should consider labeling this property differently as the Town intends to purchase a portion of this parcel for park land.
- The Sustainability Oversight Committee recommends ten-foot vehicle lanes and five-foot bike lanes for the Senator Keating Blvd extension rather than the proposed eleven foot vehicle lanes and four foot bike lanes.

Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations. We greatly appreciate everything that you are doing to plan for a sustainable future in Brighton.

Sincerely,

Sustainability Oversight Committee
Ron Wexler - Chair
Erinn Ryen - Vice Chair
Mitch Nellis
Shubhangi Gandhi
Steve Kittelberger
Paul Tankel
TO: Ramsey Boehner  
FROM: Judy Schwartz  
DATE: August 12, 2018  
RE: Envision Brighton

Before I begin my comments, I thank the team for their time and effort.

When I hear the word envision, to me it means thinking out of the box, new ideas of things not done before. In this draft, that is partly true. Conservation has not really been given as much thought in previous Comp Plans, so that is encouraging. Connectivity and sustainability, as well.

However, I was deflated when I still saw Keating Blvd. and a large land use designation for yet more office. The map on which I saw this, was not in the maps in the draft. It was, I believe, on the flier for the August 2\textsuperscript{nd} meeting when you clicked onto Barton and Logudivce.

Think out of the box for land use designations- we have more offices and office parks than Lydia Pinkham has pills. Most, if not all, have vacancies. If you follow the change in how and where people work and will be working, you will learn that many are working at home. There is no justification for more offices in this town. They are diametrically opposed to any form of conservation and sustainability- impervious surfaces, destruction of valued green space, use of fossil fuels, and bringing more cars onto the roads.

Instead, there should be a land use designation- renewable energy. I have already talked to Bill about solar power arrays on Westfall Rd. and Winton Rd. There is a way for the land to be obtained.

The other tool that should not be needed or used is Incentive Zoning. Many of us feel that past developers have always made out better than the town because Brighton goes about the process backwards. The Town should tell the applicant what amenities we want. Then calculate the value of the incentives and be sure that they are equal to the amenities.

These are my general and overall comments and I am sure that you can easily see where I am coming from and hope to go. There needs to be far more thinking out of the box because there is a lot of the same old, same old. Many lofty goals are stated in this DEIS and I have read them many times before in previous DEISes. If they had only been implemented, they would not need to be restated.

I read about half of the draft Envision Brighton GEIS (I found it too hard to continue because of the thoughts in it) and looked at the maps on the website.

On p.1, there is a very noble comment..."the adoption of the Plan and future legislation is expected to have a positive effect on the Town's environmental resources." It goes on to state, "The Comprehensive Plan should be viewed as a mitigation measure against the prospective impact of development on environmental resources...Plan strives to guide new development in a manner that will enhance the community early in the future. Environmental sustainability is one guiding principle that was determined...as being of particular importance.

To me, this is a very disturbing comment. It cannot be both ways. Development as you imagine it, will win out and the residents and environment will suffer. We already have. Though it sounds good that the plan is viewed as a mitigation measure against the prospective impact of development on environmental resources...You must admit that we should not have to mitigate any more impacts on our town. I am quite serious as the time has come, and gone in a way, to think and act differently.

We have lived in our home for just about 50 years. It would be wonderful to see in our lifetime, evidence of a real transformation of how and what we do in our town to really be sustainable and conserve the environment. We want something left for our children and five grandchildren.
TO: Mike Guyon, Commissioner of Public Works  
Ramsey Boehner, Town Planner
FROM: Louise Novros
DATE: August 13, 2018
RE: Comments on Proposed Envision Brighton 2028  
Comprehensive Plan

I would like to thank you and your staff, as well as the Comprehensive Plan Committee,  
for all the time and work that you put into this report. It was very well done and informative. I  
do have a few comments and suggestions and hope you will consider what I have to say.

**Open Space and Parkland**

Throughout this document it is stated that the town should save whatever open space is  
left in the town, including the remainder of the Faith Temple land. On the one hand it states  
there should be no more development of open space and we should “leave green space.” But a  
few lines later it states that Incentive Zoning should be used as a means of acquiring open space.
Under Core Values it states “Conserve exiting open space by promoting redevelopment of  
vacant, underutilized and obsolete commercial properties.” Which is it, save open space or let it  
be developed?

One interesting statement was that Persimmon Park is ideal for picnics. Really? In its  
current state? At that very busy corner? Where do people park? Where do people eat?

The plan also states that “[The Buckland Park] emphasizes multi-functional use zones  
and facilities to ensure that park improvements are adaptable, flexible, and multi-seasonal” and  
that this will be done through “[creative] collaboration and cooperation…” My questions is, who  
will the town be collaborating and cooperating with? Will the citizens have any say in this or  
will it be just what the developer wants?
Seniors

It is stated that Brighton has a large senior population and this should be considered in future housing plans. All of these are very large and take up lots of land. Have you surveyed seniors and their families as to what they would desire? Brighton already has at least seven large assisted living facilities. Do we really need more?

Types of Zoning and Land Use

I would like to see pictures of and have a more in-depth explanation of “form-based codes”. You say it would be used in conjunction with Incentive Zoning. What does that mean? How can you have two very different types of zoning in place for one property?

Alternative Energy

I did not see anything about future use of CCA, solar energy or wind power. The town brags that we are the first town around to pass the CCA concept, yet they are dragging their feet on getting an Administrator to start the process. Are we going to move forward with this concept?

Some other opportunities to consider for the remaining open space to the south west of Buckland Park or south of 590 would be a solar farm. The further south one goes, the less any residents will be impacted by this. When walking on the trails adjacent to the Erie Canal it is always windy! That would be a place to consider a few wind turbines.

These are some of my thoughts. Thank you for the opportunity to share them with you.

Louise Novros
lernovros@aol.com
244-3533
Hi Ramsey

I am just back from vacation today.

I very much appreciate the hard work done by staff and the committee. Some general thoughts and some matters that I, perhaps, only need direction on:

Creating a Village feel at 12 Corners was expressed as a high priority at the first open house. This included elimination of strip plazas, consolidation of parking, moving buildings closer to the street with parking in the rear with joint usage. This is, therefore, a major focus of the Plan and I entirely agree with this concept.

Given the source of funding for the Plan, I understand the focus on sustainability. That being said, however, what seems lacking are the particulars of economic feasibility of this type of development and re-development. What are the realities of purchase, demolition and redevelopment? Some input from the development community would be most helpful.

I also note the height restrictions recommended along Monroe Avenue and am not clear on this rationale. Existing properties may already exceed these limits.

Land use Figure 14 (and others). I am not clear on the location of apartment complexes. On Figure 14, they are included in commercial use. Are they differentiated elsewhere? Is there any pattern of these uses that need to be accommodated?

Similarly, location of residential facilities for Seniors would be helpful with differentiation of skilled nursing – assisted – independent. Townhomes targeted for senior/empty nesters is very popular and growing. The ability to locate them visually would be of help.

Perhaps Senior and Apartment uses could be on their own map to see how they are distributed around town.

Generally, are there separate overlays available for all uses to compare dispersion of different uses?

As discussed, why are Garden Apartments singled out and to be prohibited?

Have we/can we consider restriction of so-called, “pig snout” residential construction where the primary frontal view of the residence/townhome etc. is a 2 car garage door.

Westfall/Winton – I note the suggestion of Residential to Mixed use transition. This seems appropriate in general but how does the group see this playing out? This is very flat land and all uses would seem to be very visible. The proposals for this property all seem to be looking at larger buildings for commercial or higher density residential. What is feasible economically given land purchase and development costs? Again, developer input would be helpful.

Thanks again for all of your hard work.
Ramsey and Frank,

The attached email is in regard to the Eco Community Greenhouse comment that was included in the Comp. Plan comments we discussed this morning. I am forwarding this information for your reference.

Sincerely,

Mike

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: christina bray <clb9107@hotmail.com>
Date: Wed, Aug 8, 2018 at 11:08 AM
Subject: Hi-Tech and Eco Savvy Greenhouse design concept suggestions for the East Parcel
To: "sgandhi@razak.et" <sgandhi@razak.et>, "mike.guyon@townofbrighton.org" <mike.guyon@townofbrighton.org>
Cc: Tom Blasiak <tomblasiak@hotmail.com>, "william.moehle@townofbrighton.org" <william.moehle@townofbrighton.org>, "Robin.wilt@townofbrighton.org" <Robin.wilt@townofbrighton.org>

Dear Shubhangi and Mike,

As promised I am providing some inspiring images of Eco Community Greenhouse possibilities for the East Parcel of Buckland Park.
The possibilities are only limited by our vision! The images are sourced from the University of Wisconsin at Madison.
The link is an article from the Guardian.

Thank you for listening to the Brighton community!

Sincerely,
Christina Bray, Ph.D.
Thomas Blasiak
152 Branford Rd, Rochester NY 14618

One very cool design used in the Netherlands....

Ramsey Boehner

From: Robin Reynolds Wilt
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2018 9:36 AM
To: Ramsey Boehner
Subject: Re: Upcoming Schedule and Comments on Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan

Good Morning, Ramsey!

I know that you wanted Town Board comments on the Comprehensive Plan earlier, but I did want to echo my agreement on a couple of items Paul Tankel from the SOC highlighted:

- The SW Winton/ Westfall property is currently categorized as residential with transition to mixed use. With the Town's intent to purchase the additional 26-acre parcel and develop community space, should this portion be categorized differently?
- The Senator Keating Blvd extension with 11' vehicle lanes and a 4' bike lane should be 10' and 5' respectively, planning for a federally-compliant bike lane width.

Thanks so much for all of the committee’s hard work!

Warmly,

Robin Wilt

Robin Wilt
Member of Council
Town of Brighton
2695 East Avenue
Rochester, NY 14610
585-309-2638 - Mobile (Preferred)
585-784-5255 - Office
888-735-8309 - Facsimile
Dear Town Board Members,

At the Public Open House we received a lot of positive feedback and comments on Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan. As previously discussed, if you have any additional comments on the Comprehensive Plan or the Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement please forward them to me by tomorrow (Friday August 10th). The Steering Committee is meeting on the August 16th to forward the Plan to the Town Board by resolution. At the August 22, 2018 Town Board meeting I will be recommending that the Town Board accept the GFEIS, receive and file Steering Committee resolution and the Comprehensive Plan, and schedule a public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan for the September 12 Town Board meeting. On September 12th, the Town Board will hold the public hearing on Plan, and will hopefully adopt the Finding Statement and Comprehensive Plan by resolution.

If you have any questions regarding the matter, please feel free to contact me.

Respectfully,

Ramsey A. Boehner, Town Planner
Building and Planning Department
Town of Brighton
2300 Elmwood Avenue
Rochester, NY 14618
ramsey.boehner@townofbrighton.org
www.townofbrighton.org
Please share any additional comments or feedback you have related to the Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan.

I love the fact that town provides leaf collection, but concerned over amount of energy (equipment & man power) needed to do it. Is there a way to reduce impact without losing the service?

Additional comments may be sent to Ramsey Boehner at ramsey.boehner@townofbrighton.org
Please share any additional comments or feedback you have related to the Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan.

I am interested in townwide internet access. What taxpayers save in personal monthly costs can be put towards townwide access.

Consider a "Blue Box" or some other security device for the trail that extends into Buckland property to Sjt. Keating Blvd. — kind of isolated from population. At least until further development.

Additional comments may be sent to Ramsey Boehner at ramsey.boehner@townofbrighton.org
Please share any additional comments or feedback you have related to the Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan.

I think more should be invested into a community center. Brighton Rec facilities are less than stellar. Community rooms for rent, classroom space, summer camps, community pool(?), dance or performance space...

Additional comments may be sent to Ramsey Boehner at ramsey.boehner@townofbrighton.org
East Zone: 44 acres

Community Farm &

Eco Greenhouse for year-round community gardening & HS research studies and outreach.

Additional comments may be sent to Ramsey Boehner at ramsey.boehner@townofbrighton.org

Brighton
Please share any additional comments or feedback you have related to the Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan.

Community composting site - vermi composting establishment to convert compost into top soil and fertilizer.

Additional comments may be sent to Ramsey Boehner at ramsey.boehner@townofbrighton.org
COMMENTS

Please share any additional comments or feedback you have related to the Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan.

I love the new sidewalks along Monroe Ave with the plants absorbing rainwater and buffer from traffic.

Additional comments may be sent to Ramsey Boehner at ramsey.boehner@townofbrighton.org
I agree with plan for mixed age housing.
Many elderly are lonely in SR living facilities.
Young families could benefit from surrogate grandparents' neighbors interested in young people.
Affordable housing is also very important to allow our young couples to settle in town especially those carrying large college loan debts.

Additional comments may be sent to Ramsey Boehner at ramsey.boehner@townofbrighton.org
We need to link the neighborhoods to the major arterics. There needs to be safe pedestrian/bike access to the major roadways.

Additional comments may be sent to Ramsey Boehner at ramsey.boehner@townofbrighton.org
Please share any additional comments or feedback you have related to the Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan.

Excellent Plan

Jennifer Stover
2500 E. Mission Blvd

Additional comments may be sent to Ramsey Boehner at ramsey.boehner@townofbrighton.org
Please share any additional comments or feedback you have related to the Envision Brighton 2028 Comprehensive Plan.

Given the school buildings having been expanded yet still @ maximum capacity, we should be cognizant of residential development especially high density spots like Briar Manor.

Brighton Henrietta Road area should focus on light commercial development (environmentally sensitive). I also have concerns for development of Tarash property on French Road. I recognize it is privately owned but still...

Additional comments may be sent to Ramsey Boehner at ramsey.boehner@townofbrighton.org