

**Village of Lansing
Planning Board Meeting
October 11, 2004**

The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 P.M. by Ned Hickey. Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Doris Brown , Phil Dankert, and Carol Klepack; Alternate Planning Board Member John Piscopo; Trustee Liaison Lynn Leopold; Attorney David Dubow; Engineer Brent Cross; Code Enforcement Officer Ben Curtis; and members of the public.

-

Public Comment:

Hickey noted for the record that he was designating Alternate Planning Board Member Piscopo to serve as an Acting Member in place of Stycos who could not attend the meeting.

Hickey then opened the Public Comment period.

As there was no one present who wished to speak, Dankert moved to close the Public Comment period. Seconded by Brown. All aye.

Lansing Trails 2 – Traffic Report & SEQRA:

Hickey stated that he and Cross met with Tom LoTurco and Tim Falkner of Clough Harbor Associates to review the Traffic Study. The last report which the Planning Board has will be replaced tonight with a revised report. First, the Board will review the new Traffic Study, then Part 1 of SEQRA, and finally Part 2 of SEQRA.

LoTurco distributed the revised Traffic Study to the Planning Board . LoTurco also provided a cover letter as requested as well as another letter to guide the Board.

Page 2 of the Executive Summary for the Traffic Study was changed to include a portion of the traffic from Phase 1 of Lansing Trails in the traffic generated that will affect the Bomax/Warren intersection. This projects 50% of the traffic going to Craft Road and 50% of the traffic going to Bomax Drive.

Page 3 references the detailed analysis (15-minute) of the Warren Road/Bomax Drive/Post Office Driveway intersection determining levels of service for each approach to the intersection. This 15 minute analysis shows there is a level of service F only at the Post Office Driveway approach and then for only one 15 minute interval. The report also states that although the existing volumes meet the warrants for installation of a traffic signal, this does not require the installation of one. When Warren Road is reconstructed by the County in the future, consideration should be given at that time to the installation of a traffic light.

Page 9 explains the assumed distribution of the traffic in Lansing Trails 1 with 50% of the traffic going to Bomax Drive and 50% of the traffic to Craft Road. Page 10 then breaks down the traffic at the Bomax/ Warren Road intersection during the evening peak hour into 15 minute intervals. Pages 12-14 emphasize the fact that there is only one 15- minute interval where there is a level of service F and that is for the Post Office Driveway. Table 3 shows a level of service B before and after build-out for the 7:00-7:15 AM time period for the Post Office Left/Thru/Right movements.

Page 20 re-emphasizes that only the Post Office Driveway is at level of service F and only for one 15 minute time period.

Figure 6 has been modified to show Lansing Trails 1 and 2 trips after the project is developed. Hickey noted that the two charts on the right side must be added to get the total traffic. LoTurco stated Figures 8 & 9 have been changed to reflect the volume for both Lansing Trails 1 & 2.

Hickey stated the numbers of vehicles exiting Bomax Drive in Figure 7 is incorrect and remains the same as the old report. Hickey stated the new report should state the number of vehicles after the build-out and should indicate it has been revised and the date of the revision. LoTurco stated the Trip Generation computation shows 75 units from Lansing Trails 1. Cross stated this has not been included in other areas of the report.

Hickey feels the information is all present but some of it is difficult to find. Cross stated in his face to face meetings all his questions were answered and the report would be acceptable although some of it is difficult to understand. Hickey suggested the report have a cover sheet showing revisions in both September and October. Also Figure 7 needs to be revised with the new numbers from the computation sheets.

Hickey asked for a motion to accept the Traffic Study submitted by Clough Harbour as revised in October 2004. Klepack was uncomfortable with this. Hickey stated the Planning Board needs a corrected copy for the files. Hickey stated some technical information from the back will be moved to the front of the report. Dankert moved to accept the Traffic Study with the condition that the Planning Board receive a revised copy with changes. Seconded by Brown. Ayes by Brown, Dankert, Hickey, Klepack and Piscopo. Motion carried.

Curtis then asked for the revised long form of SEQRA. LoTurco provided it to Planning Board members. It was noted that the form has not yet been signed by Ivar and Janet Jonson. Changes were as follows: A1 changed from Rural (non-farm) to Residential (suburban); B1b changed to 29.45 acres initially and 29.45 acres ultimately; B1e changed to 100% plus or minus; B1g has been changed to 70; B1h a zero was inserted under one-family initially; B4 changed to 4.30 acres after the meeting with Cross and Hickey; B7b revised to May 2005; B7c revised to end of 2006; B25 the box "No" was checked next to City, Town, Zoning Board and submittal date to be determined; C3 added phrase "pursuant to clustering authorization" at request of Mr. Dubow; C12 revised to include the level of service at the Post Office with the corrected date.

LoTurco will get the SEQRA form signed as required and delivered to Curtis.

The Board then reviewed SEQRA Part 2 as to the proposed project impacts and their magnitude. Each of the questions in Part 2 was reviewed by the Board and the responses, including (in all appropriate instances) the level of impact determined by the Board were noted where required.

As to question 20, although there has been controversy on the project, Hickey noted there does not appear to be public controversy about adverse environmental impacts. Concerns have, however, been raised about the traffic and parkland so the box was checked "yes".

Upon completion of the Board's review of Part 2, Dubow noted there were not any "potential large impacts" identified and therefore Part 3 of the LEAF need not be completed. Hickey noted it was the traffic study which has delayed the Board. Although the project has been proposed to be built in a year and a half, it is difficult to determine a definite buildout time due to many economic factors such as interest rates, the market, etc. Hickey stated it will be important to find out from the applicant which phases will be built first, second, etc. and get additional information about staging.

Klepack moved the following resolution, seconded by Brown:

**VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SEQR REVIEW OF PROPOSED ACTION
ADOPTED ON OCTOBER 11, 2004**

WHEREAS:

- A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Preliminary plat approval of the Lansing Trails 2 Subdivision, a major cluster subdivision dividing three lots totaling 32.78 acres into 100 building lots for zero lot line townhouses and single family homes. The lots to be subdivided are east of the Lansing Trails 1 Subdivision and west of Borg Warner and the Bomax Business Park, and are located in the

Medium Density Residential District, Tax Parcel Nos. 45.1-1-50, 51.2 and 113; and

- B. This proposed action is an Unlisted Action for which the Village of Lansing Planning Board is an involved agency for the purposes of environmental review: and
- C. The Village of Lansing Planning Board and applicant have undertaken a lengthy and extensive sketch plan review process involving this action with significant public participation and input, followed by the grant of approval by the Village Board of Trustees for the proposed cluster development, all of which (i) involved significant review of environmental issues and considerations and (ii) resulted in modifications to the proposed subdivision and the inclusion of mitigating measures deemed necessary and appropriate; and
- D. On June 29, 2004 and September 28, 2004, the Village of Lansing Planning Board, in performing the lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"), (i) pursued its thorough review of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (the "Full EAF"), Part 1, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review, and (ii) thoroughly analyzed the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), whereupon at each such time it identified certain revisions and corrections to be made by the applicant and identified certain traffic and other issues to be further addressed, evaluated and supplemented with additional information;
- E. On October 11, 2004, the Village of Lansing Planning Board, in continuing to perform the lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"), (i) extended its thorough review of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (the "Full EAF"), Part 1, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review (all as revised, corrected and supplemented), (ii) thoroughly analyzed the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), and (iii) completed the Full EAF, Part 2 (and, if applicable, Part 3);

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOW:

- 1. The Village of Lansing Planning Board, based upon (i) its thorough review of the Full EAF, Part 1, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review, (ii) its thorough review of the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), and (iii) its completion of the Full EAF, Part 2 (and, if applicable, Part 3), including the findings noted thereon (which findings are incorporated herein as if set forth at length), hereby makes a negative determination of environmental significance ("Negative Declaration") in accordance with SEQR for the above referenced proposed action, and determines that an Environmental Impact Statement will not be required, such Negative Declaration to be deemed final upon (i) the applicant providing the previously submitted traffic study in final form, redated as of October, 2004 and reflecting all of the corrections cited by the Village of Lansing Planning Board and agreed to on behalf of the applicant by its consulting engineers, and (ii) the applicant providing the previously submitted Full EAF in final form, dated as of October 11, 2004, reflecting the determinations made by the Village Planning Board in Part 2 thereof, and executed by the applicant as required; and
- 2. The Responsible Officer of the Village of Lansing Planning Board is hereby authorized and directed to complete and sign as required the Full EAF Determination of Significance confirming the foregoing

Negative Declaration, which fully completed and signed Full EAF shall be attached to and made a part of this Resolution.

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

AYES: **Phil Dankert, Doris Brown, Ned Hickey, Carol Klepack, John Piscopo**

NAYS: **None**

LoTurco will provide the revised and signed documents to Curtis. Hickey stated a Public Hearing will be required as part of the preliminary plat review. Dubow noted that the Board has 62 days to hold a Public Hearing unless there is an extension requested by the applicant.

Urban Forestry Regulations:

Brown provided information to Board members regarding urban forestry taken from the International Society of Horticulture. The material gave ideas of how to protect large trees and private trees, planting of trees in ROWs, protection of public trees, etc.

Brown asked about a local law to protect trees on private property and then extending it to include trees on public ROWs. Dubow stated it is always possible to amend the Zoning Law as currently adopted to include additional provisions or restrictions. Hickey stated he is encouraging Superintendent of Public Works Dennis Reinhart to attend classes with the City of Ithaca Forester on pruning or have Assistant Rick Beckwith meet with him, but so far there has been no response from the Village Highway Department. Brown stated someone needs to be responsible for the trees. Hickey thanked Brown for her work on this topic.

Hickey stated this should not take priority over the Comprehensive Plan and reminded members that changes to each of their sections should be given to Willard. Then, the Board could proceed with urban forestry which may be a long term project. Hickey recommended Board members review all materials and jot down ideas as to what the Village should be doing to protect existing trees and/or encourage planting additional trees. Curtis was also requested to provide background on the problems he has encountered regarding tree removal on private property. Curtis stated community support will be needed to make this happen; Hickey recommended someone from the Community Party be placed on the committee to maintain contact with concerned residents. Hickey noted the Myrtle Beach ordinance identifies Heritage Trees and protects those trees. Dubow stated this will very likely be a controversial issue for residents. He also suggested that it might be helpful to advise the Board of Trustees regarding the Planning Board's review of this matter to determine the Trustees preliminary general reaction to the issues involved. Hickey stated it might be possible to add sections to the UNAs. Hickey will place this on a future agenda for further discussion.

Klepack would like to get more information on the cutting of trees and the effect on erosion control and slope stabilization. Carl Leopold recommended an ecologist as a good resource.

Reports:

Board of Trustees: Leopold reported that Fisher Associates have issued a notice to proceed for North Triphammer Road. There will also be a surface coat applied to parts of North Triphammer Road to get the Village through the winter. Some utilities will be moved this fall and the remainder in 2005. The Kline Road bypass is progressing – the Village is buying a culverts for the Village of Cayuga Heights in exchange for paving. The Triphammer Mall Planned Sign Area amendment was passed. The pylon would remain unchanged and only the lettering would be different. Curtis also noted there would be a new Reading Partnership sign placed on the pylon. Leopold also stated the Newsletter might be delayed two weeks because Willard was on vacation. Curtis reported the Newsletter was delivered to the Post Office today by Willard and would be in homes prior to the brush pick up on October 25th. The light fixtures on Ayla Way are installed but there is no light as Jonson has chosen not to have the power turned on at his expense. Cross stated he and Reinhart will meet to confirm that there are no outstanding issues and the Board can then accept the road. Leopold stated the Board has received a complaint about trash and broken glass in the Dankert playground; it needs to receive regular maintenance. Brown stated she uses it frequently with her

grandchildren and has experienced no problems. Reinhart will resolve the issues. Dubow stated that as the Village gains additional park and recreation lands, maintenance needs to be addressed by the Village as a liability issue. Hickey stated maybe an additional employee is needed in the Highway Department. Dubow stated the Board might want to consider this issue in its recommendations to the Trustees when the budget process begins. Dubow stated maintenance is required. Hickey referenced the old Recreation Committee which dealt with these issues and recommended possibly forming another committee with residents from Shannon Park, Dankert Park, Janivar Drive, etc. which would make recommendations for their neighborhood park areas. Leopold stated originally the park in Shannon Park was to be maintained by their Homeowner's Association but this never happened and the Village has maintained it. Hickey will provide information on proposed subdivision trails and parks and the need for assistance. Leopold stated the location of the main transmission line is the major topic of discussion regarding the Intermunicipal Sewer Agreement. Individual homeowners have been contacted so the engineers can walk the proposed route for the sewer line down the old railroad bed. Hartill has recommended a subcommittee of Hartill, Moore, Leopold and Hickey be formed to consider the impacts of running the sewer main through the unique natural area of the Village as well as considering alternate routes such as East Shore Drive.

Approval of Minutes – Sept. 28th:

The minutes for the September 28 meeting were not yet ready for the Board's review.

Other Business as Time Permits:

Brown expressed her concerns about the increase in the amount of traffic on Uptown Road.

Adjournment:

Dankert moved to adjourn at 9:50 P.M. Seconded by Piscopo. Ayes by Brown, Dankert, Hickey, Klepack and Piscopo. Motion carried.