

**Village of Lansing
Planning Board and Board of Trustees
Joint Meeting
June 29, 2010**

1 The joint meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board and the Village of Lansing Board of
2 Trustees was called to order at 7:33 P.M. by Planning Board Chairman Mario Tomei and Mayor
3 Hartill. Present at the meeting were Planning Board Chairman Mario Tomei; Planning Board
4 Members, Maria Stycos, Phil Dankert, Lisa Schleelein and Alternate Member Ned Hickey who
5 was appointed as an Acting Member; Mayor Don Hartill; Trustees John O'Neill, Larry Fresinski
6 and Julie Baker; Also present were Village Attorney David Dubow; Code Enforcement Officer
7 Ben Curtis, Code Enforcement Officer in training Marty Moseley; Clerk/Treasurer Jodi Dake;
8 Jim Bold, Eric Goetzman and Gina Speno from Triax Management Group; Dan Veaner from the
9 Lansing Star; resident Nick Vascek; Stacy Black; Yong Pei and William Straub; Chris Vitale;
10 and Community Party observer Robert Schleelein.

11 Tomei appointed alternate Ned Hickey as an Acting Planning Board member for Richard Durst
12 who could not attend the meeting.

13 **Public Comment**

14 Mayor Hartill opened the public comment period. Robert Schleelein introduced himself as the observer
15 from the Community Party. Vascek pointed the Board's attention to an article in the Ithaca Journal on
16 June 5th2010 titled Mall Developer pursues IDA help. Bill Straub introduced himself as the representative
17 for the Chang family. With no one else to speak, Fresinski moved to close the public comment period.
18 Seconded by Baker. Ayes by Hartill, Baker, O'Neill, and Fresinski.

19 **Public Hearing to Consider;**

20
21 After the Public Comment Period, Mayor Hartill requested a motion to open the Public Hearing.
22

23 Motion-To Open the Public Hearing to Consider a Conditional and final authorization of the
24 proposed Lansing Meadows Planned Development Area (formerly Triax Planned Development Area), to
25 rezone approximately 11.19 acres of land between Oakcrest Road and the Shops at Ithaca Mall in the
26 Commercial Low Traffic District, Tax Parcel Nos. 47.1-1-17.2 & 47.1-1-17.6 to be a planned
27 development area (PDA) in accordance with (i) subsection C [entitled "Planned development area"] of
28 Section 145-33 [entitled "Districts enumerated"] of Article IV [entitled "District Regulations"] of Chapter
29 145 [entitled "Zoning" and referred to and cited as the "Village of Lansing Zoning Law"] of the Village
30 of Lansing Code and (ii) Appendix A-2 [entitled "Planned Development Area (PDA)"] of said Chapter
31 145. The PDA will include an approximately 82,000SF retail center, residential buildings providing an
32 anticipated total of 12 senior housing units, and enhanced wetlands adapted to provide a bird habitat. The
33 action includes final authorization of a final development plan by the Village Board of Trustees and
34 adoption by the Board of Trustees of a local law [Proposed Local Law B (2010)] amending the Village
35 Zoning Law and Zoning Map to incorporate the authorized Lansing Meadows Planned Development Area
36 and thereby reclassify such area from its existing Commercial Low Traffic District (CLT) zoning
37 designation on the Village of Lansing Zoning Map to the new Lansing Meadows PDA designation, such
38 area to be subject to the new Lansing Meadows PDA zoning district regulations as set forth in Proposed
39 Local Law B (2010).

40 Fresinski moved to open the public hearing. Seconded by Baker. Ayes by Hartill, Baker, Fresinski, and
41 O'Neill.

42 Straub explained that the Chang family opposed the rezoning provided for in the proposed
43 Lansing Meadows Planned Development Area (PDA). Straub noted that the Chang's are concerned about
44 the increase in traffic, noise, pollution, and the devaluation of their property on Oakcrest Road. Mayor
45 Hartill noted that the property is currently zoned Commercial Low Traffic (CLT), which if rezoned a
46 residential district as provide for in the proposed PDA would be a down grade from the current zoning
47 and would presumably have less effect on the Chang's property. Dubow explained that the purpose and
48 intent of a Planned Development Area (PDA), also known as a Planned Unit Development
49 (PUD), as authorized by Section 7-703-a of the New York State Village Law, is to provide for
50 residential, commercial, industrial or other land uses, or a mix of such uses, in which economies
51 of scale, creative architectural or planning concepts and open space preservation may be
52 achieved by a developer in furtherance of the Village Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Law. It is
53 also intended to provide a degree of flexibility in conventional land use and design regulations
54 which will encourage development in an imaginative and innovative way, with public
55 participation, aimed at a more suitable environment and protection of community interests. The
56 recently adopted local law amending the Village Zoning Law so as to permit PDA's in the
57 Village includes language in Appendix A-2 indicating that a PDA is primarily related to
58 achieving innovations in residential development and mixed development so that the demand for
59 housing at all economic levels can be met by greater variety in type, design and siting of
60 dwelling units and nonresidential facilities and so that the conservation and more effective use of
61 limited land can be achieved. Dubow explained that under the current CLT designation along a
62 portion of Oakcrest Road certain commercial businesses, like restaurants, could be located in that
63 area which is part of the proposed PDA parcel. That being the case, it was quite possible that
64 such CLT uses would increase traffic on Oakcrest Road more than the residential development
65 being proposed as part of the PDA. It was also noted that the developer of the proposed PDA had
66 submitted a traffic study to the Village indicating that traffic would not increase in a negative
67 manner. The Village then had Fisher Associates, its traffic consultant, review the traffic study,
68 and they confirmed the traffic study findings. Baker asked how the PDA would effect property
69 value. Dubow stated that although it is speculative as to any development's affect on property
70 owners, theoretically the Lansing Meadows PDA should not depreciate any residential property
71 values on Oakcrest Road since the proposed development on the portion of the property fronting
72 on Oakcrest will be restricted to residential. It was further pointed out that the proposed
73 commercial development as part of the PDA will have access only to North Triphammer Road
74 and not to Oakcrest Road. Dubow noted that under the Village's new PDA provisions a PDA is
75 to provide a benefit for the Village. With the Lansing Meadows PDA, the senior housing
76 component along Oakcrest Road locks in a residential development instead of having a CLT
77 business develop the area. Schleelein asked what type of business would be allowed in CLT.
78 Curtis stated that there are a number of CLT permitted commercial uses such as a sit down
79 restaurant or storage facility. Straub asked what the result of the noise pollution study was. Curtis
80 noted that there is no noise pollution study that he was aware of, but the buffers incorporated in
81 the Lansing Meadows PDA would reduce the noise pollution to the residential neighbors. Curtis
82 noted that the Village has always been sensitive to noise issues, and gave the example of Tops
83 Markets having had a delivery arrive at approximately 4:00 AM, which was disrupting residents
84 on the Highgate Circle and which delivery schedule was altered at the request of the Village.
85 Curtis explained that his office usually responds to calls of that nature. Curtis stated that he

86 called Tops and worked out a different delivery time. Dubow stated that the buffer area between
87 the proposed commercial component and the residential component of the PDA would be
88 maintained in perpetuity, and has been designed with the intent of buffering any noise associated
89 with the commercial component from the residences along Oakcrest Road. Hickey reiterated that
90 the developer's traffic study performed by GTS Consulting declared that there would be no
91 negative impact along Oakcrest Road because of the development, which preceded the Village's
92 study by Fisher Associates confirming that finding. Hickey stated that most people driving to the
93 mall use Route 13 and Triphammer Road to commute, not Cayuga Heights and Oakcrest Roads.
94 Straub asked why the PDA could not be built somewhere else in the Village, like along East
95 Shore Drive at Lake Watch. Curtis replied that would be a nonconforming use in a residential
96 district with no public sewer. Dubow explained that if the Board of Trustees were to approve the
97 PDA, the developer would have to work through the special permit process with the Planning
98 Board. Vascek asked if there was a noise ordinance enforced in the Village. Mayor Hartill stated
99 that it is very hard to enforce a noise ordinance, and that there is a sign on Route 13 that limits a
100 noise level of 90 decibels. Curtis noted that usually the noise level would be measured at the
101 property lines. Curtis noted that it is tricky to enforce because a lawn mower's ambient noise
102 level is not much different from a go-cart's. Curtis noted that calling a business and working
103 through a problem, like with the early morning Tops delivery, is a common practice of his office.
104 Vascek asked if there was a time in which there could not be excessive noise at night, since the
105 ambient noise level at night is more sensitive. Curtis noted that after 10 P.M. the matter becomes
106 a civil matter and the police should to be called. Vascek asked if there would be trees
107 incorporated with the parking lot of the commercial component of the PDA. Hickey stated that
108 the developer would supply the Planning Board with a landscaping plan when working through
109 the steps of the special permit. Hickey noted that on the west side of the mall, there were trees
110 planted to buffer Shannon Park residents from sound and light. Dubow noted that if there were
111 no other environmental comments, the Board of Trustees could finalize the Full Environmental
112 Assessment Form.

113 Dubow stated that the PDA law was submitted to the County Planning Department for an
114 independent review, which was received by the Village on June 25th, 2010, with a declaration
115 that it would have no negative inter-community or county-wide impacts. Straub asked if there
116 was hard data that would support the traffic study in real life. Mayor Hartill noted that the
117 Village had a traffic study performed before the Triphammer Road project, and the traffic study
118 was very comparable to the actual operation of Triphammer Road. Curtis added that when the
119 mall expanded to add Dicks, Borders, Best Buy, and Target, the traffic study reflected the actual
120 operation of the intersections that were evaluated. Dubow added that the Tops plaza was also
121 incorporated in the traffic study. Hickey noted that the real evidence is traffic accidents, which
122 are very few.

123 Veaner asked what will happen if or when the Lansing Fire Department expands their
124 facilities on Oakcrest Road. Mayor Hartill noted that the building would remain the same besides
125 an addition to the west. Veaner asked if that would cause any problems with the residents around
126 the fire station. Mayor Hartill stated that this particular fire station is not very active and the only
127 reason they are expanding it to be able to house two fire trucks instead of one. Curtis added that
128 the Fire Department would very likely have to proceed with a special permit too. Veaner noted
129 that the fire station would not impact traffic even if an addition was to be added. Hartill agreed,
130 and added that the voting for the Village now takes place at the Village office, which also
131 decreased traffic. Straub asked if the Board of Trustees would compensate the residents of that

132 area because the commercial component built along Oakcrest Rd would decrease their value.
133 Mayor Hartill noted that by authorizing the proposed PDA the Board of Trustees would be doing
134 the exact opposite. The Board will be switching the property along Oakcrest to residential zoning
135 instead of its current zoning of commercial low traffic. Dubow explained and pointed out that
136 Area B on the PDA map would be rezoned from commercial low traffic to a residential area,
137 which benefits the Village and residents.

138 Vaczek commended the Village on having the most diverse and dense housing in
139 Tompkins County. Vaczek noted that he would hope that the Village might someday financially
140 invest in a development, like how the Town of Lansing helped develop Woodsedge. Vaczek
141 asked if a centrally located park would be out of the question for the Village. Mayor Hartill
142 stated that the Village does have a park on Uptown Road. Tomei added that the Village also has
143 a network of trails for people to walk on. Vaczek asked if the Lansing Meadow PDA would be
144 contributing park land or trails to the Village. Curtis explained that parkland is usually provided
145 in conjunction with subdivisions of land. Dubow noted that the law in New York State is clear in
146 stating that the exaction of land from a subdivision development is on a need basis, and the
147 developer in some instances can substitute money equivalent to the park land or trails that would
148 otherwise be required. Hickey stated that the Village does not have a “grand park,” it has instead
149 parks associated with particular developments, like Shannon Park and Lansing Trails I. Hickey
150 noted that for the 25 years that he has been on the Planning Board, they have tried to incorporate
151 a central location for a park that people could enjoy in the Village, but the owners of the land
152 areas that the Planning Board have been interested in have not been interested in donating their
153 land to the Village for that purpose.

154 ***Chapter 125-26 of the Village code: Recreational Land is included with these**
155 **minutes***

156 **Hartill entertained a motion from Fresinski. Seconded by O’Neill. Ayes from Hartill,**
157 **Baker, Fresinski, and O’Neill.**

158 Dubow stated that the recommendation that is needed from the Planning Board to the Board of
159 Trustees for authorization of the proposed PDA and adoption of Proposed Local Law B (2010),
160 which recommendation was in fact made by the Planning Board at its previous meeting, would
161 be incorporated in these minutes of June 29th, 2010. Tomei asked for a motion to reaffirm the
162 Planning Board’s prior recommendation. Moved by Dankert. Seconded by Hickey. Ayes by
163 Tomei, Hickey, Schleelein, Dankert, and Stycos.

164 Bold explained that the exterior of the commercial component would be similar to the Shops at
165 Ithaca Mall façade. Dubow noted that the poles for lighting would be limited to 30 feet in height
166 as expressly provided in Proposed Local Law B (2010). Curtis added that typically the lighting
167 for the mall had been 50 feet or more. Bold also explained that he has submitted a detailed
168 planting list to Curtis who forwarded it on to the Tompkins County Planning Department for
169 review under the 239-l and -m. Dubow noted that the conditions of the developer’s statement of
170 intent that have not been met will be incorporated into the special permit procedure. Veaner
171 asked if they could start building and developing the land if this local law was approved. Dubow
172 explained that the local law would authorize the proposed uses and development, but the
173 development and construction would have to work through the special permit process. Dubow
174 noted that the special permit process requires a public hearing, which gives the public a further
175 chance to express their opinions.

176 Resolution #5641-SEQR Review Negative Declaration Related to Lansing Meadows

177 PDA Authorization and Proposal Local Law B (2010) Adoption

178 **WHEREAS:**

179 A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Conditional and
180 final authorization of the proposed Lansing Meadows Planned Development Area
181 (formerly Triax Planned Development Area), to rezone approximately 11.19 acres of land
182 between Oakcrest Road and the Shops at Ithaca Mall in the Commercial Low Traffic
183 District, Tax Parcel Nos. 47.1-1-17.2 & 47.1-1-17.6 to be a planned development area
184 (PDA) in accordance with (i) subsection C [entitled “Planned development area”] of
185 Section 145-33 [entitled “Districts enumerated”] of Article IV [entitled “District
186 Regulations”] of Chapter 145 [entitled “Zoning” and referred to and cited as the “Village
187 of Lansing Zoning Law”] of the Village of Lansing Code and (ii) Appendix A-2 [entitled
188 “Planned Development Area (PDA)"] of said Chapter 145. The PDA will include an
189 approximately 82,000SF retail center, residential buildings providing an anticipated total
190 of 12 senior housing units, and enhanced wetlands adapted to provide a bird habitat. The
191 action includes final authorization of a final development plan by the Village Board of
192 Trustees and adoption by the Board of Trustees of a local law [Proposed Local Law B
193 (2010)] amending the Village Zoning Law and Zoning Map to incorporate the authorized
194 Lansing Meadows Planned Development Area and thereby reclassify such area from its
195 existing Commercial Low Traffic District (CLT) zoning designation on the Village of
196 Lansing Zoning Map to the new Lansing Meadows PDA designation, such area to be
197 subject to the new Lansing Meadows PDA zoning district regulations as set forth in
198 Proposed Local Law B (2010); and

199 B. The proposed action is an Unlisted Action for which the Village of Lansing Board of
200 Trustees is an involved agency for the purposes of environmental review; and

201 C. On June 7, 2010, at a joint meeting of the Village of Lansing Board of Trustees and
202 Village of Lansing Planning Board, the Village Board of Trustees, in performing the lead
203 agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in
204 accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the
205 State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQR”), and with the Village of Lansing
206 Planning Board (i) commenced its thorough review of the Full Environmental
207 Assessment Form (the “Full EAF”), Part 1, and any and all other documents prepared and
208 submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review, including
209 the comments, suggestions, conditions and recommendations provided by the Village of
210 Lansing Planning Board, and(ii) commenced its thorough analysis of the potential
211 relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a
212 significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6
213 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), whereupon it determined that additional traffic study
214 information and input was necessary from the Village’s traffic consultant to confirm the
215 traffic analysis provided by the PDA developer; and

216 D. On June 29, 2010, the Village of Lansing Board of Trustees, in performing the lead
217 agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in
218 accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the
219 State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQR”), (i) continued and completed its
220 thorough review of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (the “Full EAF”), Part 1,
221 and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed
222 action and its environmental review, [including traffic study materials and information
223 provided by the Village’s traffic consultant; additional comments, suggestions, conditions
224 and recommendations, if any, provided by the Village of Lansing Planning Board; and
225 comments and recommendations, if any, provided by the Tompkins County Department
226 of Planning in accordance with General Municipal Law Sections 239-1 and –m)], and(ii)
227 continued and completed its thorough analysis of the potential relevant areas of
228 environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse
229 impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section
230 617.7(c), and (iii) completed the Full EAF, Part 2 (and, if applicable, Part 3);

231 **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:**

- 232 1. The Village of Lansing Board of Trustees, based upon (i) its thorough review of the
233 Full EAF, Part 1, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with
234 respect to this proposed action and its environmental review, (ii) its thorough review
235 of the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed
236 action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the
237 criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), and (iii) its completion of the Full
238 EAF, Part 2 (and, if applicable, Part 3), including the findings noted thereon (which
239 findings are incorporated herein as if set forth at length), hereby makes a negative
240 determination of environmental significance (“**NEGATIVE DECLARATION**”) in
241 accordance with SEQR for the above referenced proposed action, and determines that
242 an Environmental Impact Statement will not be required; and:
- 243 2. The Responsible Officer of the Village of Lansing Board of Trustees is hereby
244 authorized and directed to complete and sign as required the Full EAF Determination
245 of Significance confirming the foregoing **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, which
246 fully completed and signed Full EAF shall be attached to and made a part of this
247 Resolution.

248 The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

249 Trustee Baker moved this resolution. Trustee O’Neill seconded the motion. A
250 vote was taken:

251	Mayor Donald Hartill-Aye	Trustee Julie Baker-Aye
252	Trustee John O’Neill-Aye	Trustee Larry Fresinski-Aye

253 Mayor Hartill asked if there were any additional issues or comments from the public as to other than
254 environmental matters related to the proposed PDA and Local Law B (2010). There were none.

255 Motion- To Close the Public Hearing

256 Trustee Fresinski moved to close the public hearing. Trustee O’Neill seconded the
257 motion. A vote was taken:

258 Mayor Donald Hartill-Aye
259 Trustee John O’Neill-Aye

Trustee Julie Baker-Aye
Trustee Larry Fresinski-Aye

260 Dubow explained that at the Planning Board’s last meeting they adopted a resolution
261 recommending to the Board of Trustees the conditional and final authorization of the Lansing
262 Meadows PDA and the adoption of Proposed Local Law B (2010). The Planning Board
263 reaffirmed its recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

264 Resolution #5642- Adopt Proposed Local Law B (2010) as Local Law 4, 2010-
265 **Amendment of the Village of Lansing Zoning Law and Zoning**
266 **Map to Incorporate Lansing Meadows Planned Development Area and**
267 **District Regulations Therefor**

268 Be it enacted by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Lansing as follows:

269
270 **SECTION I. PURPOSE AND INTENT.**

271 The purpose and intent of this Local Law is to amend (i) Chapter 145 [entitled “Zoning”
272 and referred to and cited as the “Village of Lansing Zoning Law”] of the Village of Lansing
273 Code and (ii) the Zoning Map of the Village of Lansing [as defined in section 145-3 (entitled
274 “Terms defined”) and as provided for in sections 145-34 (entitled “Zoning Map”) and 145-35
275 (entitled “Interpretations of Zoning Map boundaries”) of said Chapter 145 of the Village of
276 Lansing Code] so as to reflect the incorporation and mapping of the Lansing Meadows Planned
277 Development Area [hereinafter referred to as the “Lansing Meadows PDA”] and its specific
278 zoning district regulations, the final authorization for which is hereby legislatively granted by the
279 Board of Trustees of the Village of Lansing in accordance with (i) subsection C [entitled
280 “Planned development area”] of Section 145-33 [entitled “Districts enumerated”] of Article IV
281 [entitled “District Regulations”] of said Chapter 145 and (ii) Section 8 of Appendix A-2 [entitled
282 “Planned Development Area (PDA)”] of said Chapter 145.

283 More specifically, the purpose and intent of this Local Law is to:

- 284 (i) add a new section 145-42.1 [entitled “Lansing Meadows PDA”] of said Chapter
285 145 defining and establishing the regulations for the newly authorized Lansing
286 Meadows PDA and the identified Areas A, B and C delineated therein;
287 (ii) add a new subsection “O” [entitled “One-unit residential building, two-unit
288 residential building and multiunit residential building in Lansing Meadows PDA

289 Area B”] under section 145-60 [entitled “Additional conditions for certain Special
290 Permit uses”] of said Chapter 145 setting forth the additional conditions required
291 for special permit uses in “Area B” of the newly authorized Lansing Meadows
292 PDA; and
293 (iii) provide for a Zoning Map amendment reflecting the newly authorized Lansing
294 Meadows PDA designated area and the identified Areas A, B and C delineated
295 therein.

296 **SECTION II. AMENDMENTS.**

297
298 Chapter 145 [entitled “Zoning” and referred to and cited as the “Village of Lansing
299 Zoning Law”] of the Village of Lansing Code is hereby amended as follows:

300
301 A. A new section 145-42.1 [entitled “Lansing Meadows PDA”] of said Chapter 145 is
302 hereby added setting forth the legislative intent for the establishment of such Lansing
303 Meadows PDA and the standard regulations therefor, such new section 145-42.1
304 reading in its entirety as follows:

305 **§ 145-42.1 Lansing Meadows PDA.**

306 **A. Intent. The legislative intent of this subsection is to define and establish standard**
307 **regulations for this Planned Development Area called Lansing Meadows PDA**
308 **containing a commercial area (Area A), a residential area (Area B) and a**
309 **protected wetland/bird habitat (Area C) [see Zoning Map amendment]; where**
310 **public utilities to serve such facilities are available; where areas that border on**
311 **Oakcrest Road are reserved for residential uses, thereby preserving the residential**
312 **environment of the surrounding areas; where residential uses in Area B are**
313 **reserved for senior housing thereby providing an appropriate housing option for**
314 **senior citizens within walking distance of commercial and recreational services;**
315 **where vehicular access to the commercial development in the PDA is solely from**
316 **the adjacent commercial property, thereby minimizing traffic impact on Oakcrest**
317 **Road and surrounding residential areas; and where existing wetlands are**
318 **preserved and enhanced as a bird habitat and to provide a buffer between the**
319 **residential and commercial development in the PDA and further buffer the**
320 **commercial development in the PDA from Oakcrest Road.**

321 **B. Permitted uses. Permitted uses shall be as follows:**

322 **Areas A & B**

- 323 **(1) Utility service underground.**
324 **(2) Natural parks.**

- 325 (3) **Alteration to Building or Improved Site or Change in Use that Does Not Result**
326 **in Change in Applicable Parking Space Requirements.**

327 **Area C**

- 328 (1) **Utility service underground.**
329 (2) **Natural parks.**

- 330 **C. Permitted uses with additional conditions. Uses permitted with additional conditions**
331 **shall be as follows:**

332 **Area A**

- 333 (1) **Temporary commercial activities. (see subsection C under § 145-58)**

- 334 **D. Permitted with Special Permit. Uses permitted with a Special Permit shall be as**
335 **follows:**

336 **Area A**

- 337 (1) **General conditions.**
338 (a) **Utility transmission/storage/plants.**
339 (b) **Indoor recreation/club.**
340 (c) **Office/studio/service.**
341 (d) **Government buildings.**
342 (e) **Motel/hotel.**
343 (f) **Sales/Repair/Maintenance.**
344 (g) **Theater/nightclub/discotheque.**
345 (h) **Alteration to Building or improved Site or Change in Use that Results in**
346 **Change in Applicable Parking Space Requirements.**
347 (i) **Museums/public buildings.**
348 (j) **Low Traffic Food and Beverage.**
349 (k) **High Traffic Food and Beverage.**

- 350 (2) **General and additional conditions.**

351 **Area A**

- 352 (a) **Mixed Use. (see subsection F under § 145-60)**

353 **Area B**

- 354 (a) **One-unit residential building. (see subsection O under § 145-60)**
355 (b) **Two-unit residential building. (see subsection O under § 145-60)**
356 (c) **Multiunit residential building. (see subsection O under § 145-60)**
357 (d) **Home occupation. (see subsection D under § 145-60)**

- 358 **E. Dimensions: lot, yard, building and parking requirements. Lot, yard, building and**
359 **parking requirements shall be as follows:**

- 360 (1) **Minimum lot size.**

- 361 (a) **All Uses: ten thousand (10,000) square feet.**

362 (2) **Maximum lot coverage: none, except what is required by minimum street**
363 **frontage, front, side and rear yard setbacks and by front, side and rear parking**
364 **requirements.**

365 (3) **Minimum street frontage.**
366 (a) **All uses: seventy-five (75) feet.**

367 (4) **Front yard setback minimum**
368 (a) **One and two-unit residential and multiunit residential buildings:**
369 **forty (40) feet.**
370 (b) **All other principal uses: seventy-five (75) feet.**

371 (5) **Side yard setback minimum, all uses: twenty-five (25) feet.**

372
373 (6) **Rear yard setback minimum:**
374 (a) **All principal uses: forty (40) feet.**
375 (b) **All accessory buildings: twenty-five (25) feet.**

376 (7) **Parking setback standards.**
377 (a) **Front yard, all uses: twenty-five (25) feet.**
378 (b) **Side yard, all uses: fifteen (15) feet.**
379 (c) **Rear yard, all uses: fifteen (15) feet.**

380 (8) **Building/structure height maximum.**
381 (a) **All principal uses: thirty-five (35) feet.**
382 (b) **All accessory buildings: fifteen (15) feet.**
383 (c) **Exterior lights: Thirty (30) feet.**

384 (9) **Parking requirements: see Article V.**

385 (10) **Buffer strip width: seventy-five (75) feet. (see § 145-24)**

386 B. A new subsection "O" [entitled "One-unit residential building, two-unit residential
387 building and multiunit residential building in Lansing Meadows PDA Area B"] under
388 section 145-60 of said Chapter 145 is hereby added setting forth the additional
389 conditions required for special permit uses in "Area B" of the newly authorized
390 Lansing Meadows PDA, such new subsection O under section 145-60 reading in its
391 entirety as follows:

392 **O. One-unit residential building, two-unit residential building and multiunit**
393 **residential building in Lansing Meadows PDA Area B.**

394 (1) **Housing units in the Lansing Meadows PDA Area B shall meet Fair**
395 **Housing Act definition of “housing for older persons”.**

396 C. The Zoning Map of the Village of Lansing [as defined in section 145-3 (entitled
397 “Terms defined”) and as provided for in sections 145-34 (entitled “Zoning Map”) and
398 145-35 (entitled “Interpretations of Zoning Map boundaries”) of said Chapter 145 of
399 the Village of Lansing Code] is hereby amended so as to reflect (i) the newly
400 authorized Lansing Meadows PDA and its designated area [being tax parcel numbers
401 47.1-1-17.2 and 47.1-1-17.6], and (ii) the identified Areas A, B and C delineated
402 therein, the boundaries of such Lansing Meadows PDA and the identified Areas A, B
403 and C delineated therein being more specifically depicted on a certain Plan entitled
404 “Lansing Meadows PDA,” File No. 14729.44890-Fig.1, dated June 2010, prepared by
405 O’Brien & Gere Engineers, Inc., a copy of which is on file with the Village of
406 Lansing. A portion of such area [being tax parcel number 47.1-1-17.6] is also more
407 specifically depicted on a certain survey entitled “Survey Map – Lands of Joseph M.
408 and Martha C. Ballantyne, Military Lot 98, Village and Town of Lansing, County of
409 Tompkins – State of New York,” a copy of which is also on file with the Village of
410 Lansing. The above referenced and depicted PDA area is hereby reclassified from its
411 existing Commercial Low Traffic District (CLT) zoning designation on the Village of
412 Lansing Zoning Map to the new Lansing Meadows PDA designation, such area and
413 the identified Areas A, B and C delineated therein being subject to the new Lansing
414 Meadows PDA zoning district regulations as provided for herein and as set forth in
415 the new section 145-42.1 [entitled “Lansing Meadows PDA”] of Chapter 145 of the
416 Village of Lansing Code.

417
418 **SECTION III. SUPERSEDING EFFECT.**

419 All local laws, resolutions, rules, regulations and other enactments of the Village of Lansing in conflict
420 with the provisions of this local law are hereby superseded to the extent necessary to give this local law full force
421 and effect.
422

423 **SECTION IV. VALIDITY.**

424 The invalidity of any provision of this local law shall not affect the validity of any other provision of this
425 local law that can be given effect without such invalid provision.

426 **SECTION V. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

427 This Local Law shall be effective ten (10) days after publication and posting as required
428 by law, except that it shall be effective from the date of service as against a person served with a
429 copy thereof, certified by the Village Clerk, and showing the date of its passage and entry in the
430 Minutes of the Village Board of Trustees.

431 Trustee Fresinski moved this resolution. Trustee O’Neill seconded the motion. A vote was taken:

432 Mayor Donald Hartill-Aye
433 Trustee John O'Neill-Aye

Trustee Julie Baker-Aye
Trustee Larry Fresinski-Aye

434 **In-service Training-How Industrial Development Authority Financing Works**
435 *Mike Stamm- Tompkins County Area Development*

436 Tomei introduced Mike Stamm who is president of the Tompkins County Area Development (TCAD).
437 Stamm explained that IDA has the ability to abate property, school, and sales taxes to companies in
438 Tompkins County. The IDA also has the ability to partially abate the mortgage recording tax. Stamm
439 explained that most of the Business and Technology Park and the Mold Flow building on North
440 Triphammer Road have had some sort of help from the IDA. Stamm noted that another tool that could
441 be utilized from the IDA is a PIF (Pilot Increment Financing). Stamm gave an example using the
442 Lansing Meadows PDA. Stamm noted that the commercial component would pay their property taxes,
443 in which a portion of those taxes would be taken to support the residential component. Stamm noted that
444 if a taxing entity decided to not participate in the abatement, the project could still move forward. The
445 project would not receive all of the tax abatement, only a partial abatement. Stamm pointed out that with
446 a PIF each entity that is affected (Village, Town, County, and School) would have the opportunity to
447 either keep the taxes that they are entitled to or wave the taxes to benefit the proposed project.
448 Schleelein asked how realistic it is for a project or business to become approved for a PIF. Stamm noted
449 that it depends on how the community benefits from the project, and it depends on the ability for the
450 project to prove that it needs help financially. Mayor Hartill asked if the major focus for the IDA is job
451 creation. Stamm stated that the focus varies; some might be housing density or job creation. Curtis asked
452 about the tax abatement and how much it decreases each year. Stamm explained the chart below is
453 typical tax abatement, but noted that the TCAD could vote to alter the percentage of abatement or
454 number of years.

455	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>ABATEMENT</u>
456	1	90%
457	2	77%
458	3	64%
459	4	51%
460	5	39%
461	6	26%
462	7	13%

463 After the In Service IDA Training the Board of Trustees separated from the Planning Board
464 and continued with their own separate meeting.

465 **Approval of Minutes**

466 Hickey moved the minutes of May 25th, 2010 as corrected. Seconded by Schleelein, Ayes by
467 Stycos, Tomei, Schleelein, Hickey, and Dankert.

468 Hickey moved the minutes of May 25th, 2010 as corrected. Seconded by Dankert, Ayes by Stycos,
469 Tomei, Schleelein, Hickey, and Dankert.

Reports

470 *Board of Trustees- no meeting*

471 **Adjournment**

472 Hickey moved to adjourn at 9:45 P.M. Seconded by Dankert. Ayes by Hickey, Stycos, Tomei, Dankert
473 and Schleelein