

**Village of Lansing
Planning Board Meeting
August 18, 2010**

1 The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:34 P.M. by Chairman
2 Mario Tomei. Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Maria Stycos, Phil Dankert, Richard
3 Durst and Lisa Schleelein; Alternate Planning Board Member Ned Hickey; Village Attorney David
4 Dubow; Code Enforcement Officer Marty Moseley; Village Engineer Brent Cross; Superintendent of
5 Public Works John Courtney; Jim Bold and Eric Goetzmann from Triax Management Group; Residents
6 Basia Kaminska, Eswar Prasad, and Nick Vaczek; Architect George Breuhaus, and Joan De Boer
7 observing for the Community Party.
8

9 **Public Comment**

10 Tomei opened the public comment period. Prasad introduced himself and explained that he and
11 Kaminska both live at 8 Stone Creek Drive. Prasad explained that there is no place for children to
12 congregate and play in the Shannon Park development. Prasad wondered who owned the piece of
13 property at the four way stop next to the pond. Prasad noted that it might be a nice place for a small
14 playground. Tomei asked if there is a homeowners association in that area. Prasad stated that they
15 do have a homeowners association and will contact the Shannon Park homeowners association,
16 which is separate from the homeowners association they are familiar with. Dubow noted that the lot
17 that is being discussed was originally used for stormwater management. Dubow also noted that the
18 Planning Board could make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees for the recreational area. Dubow
19 added that the Board of Trustees is the correct board to deal with the issue regarding parkland designation.

20 Joan De Boer introduced herself as the Community Party Observer. With no one else wishing to speak,
21 Stycos moved to close the public hearing. Seconded by Schleelein. Ayes by Stycos, Dankert, Durst,
22 Tomei and Schleelein
23

24 **Village of Lansing Department of Public Works Garage:**

25 Tomei opened the public hearing for

26 **Special Permit 2495**, The Village of Lansing Department of Public Works, to construct a
27 4000 square foot addition on the current Department of Public Works garage in the Commercial
28 Low Traffic District, Tax Parcel No. 45.2-1-46.10. Because the DPW garage addition is being
29 constructed in the Commercial Low Traffic District, Special Permit review is required pursuant to
30 Section 145-42D(1) of the Village of Lansing Code.

31 Tomei introduced George Breuhaus who is the architect for the Department of Public Works
32 (DPW) addition. Breuhaus explained that the Village DPW addition will be approximately 4000 square
33 feet, and in that 4000 square feet will be rooms for mechanical and tool storage, a mezzanine, a wash bay,
34 a truck bay, a tractor/backhoe bay, and a small truck bay that will accommodate their one ton truck.
35 Breuhaus noted that the height of the new addition will be greater than the current building due to the
36 height required to accommodate the large trucks and equipment. Breuhaus noted that the ten wheeler will
37 pull into the first bay, the six wheeler will pull into the second bay, the backhoe will be parked in the third
38 bay, and the one ton truck will park in the last bay. Breuhaus pointed out that due to the turning radius for
39 the ten wheeler and six wheeler, they can only park in the first two bays. Breuhaus noted that there will be
40 trench drains installed and connected to a new oil/water separator. Breuhaus noted that there will be a new
41 concrete apron so the equipment can be worked on outside. Breuhaus explained that there will be new
42 catch basins installed for storm water runoff.

43 Breuhaus pointed out that there are mature pine trees and fencing that buffer the current DPW
44 garage. Breuhaus added that the current salt storage building also acts as a buffer. Hickey asked what the
45 height of the new addition would be. Breuhaus stated that the peak would be a little taller than the salt
46 storage building but the walls will be the same height. The walls on the salt storage building are currently

47 16 feet tall. Breuhaus pointed out that there will be areas that will be visible from certain St. Joseph Lane
48 properties, and suggested that the best alternative for buffering would be fencing. Breuhaus noted that the
49 DPW currently uses parts of the existing fence as a backer for pipes since there is a limited area for the
50 DPW to operate, so the fencing would allow the DPW to utilize more useable space than if trees and
51 shrubs were used.

52 Breuhaus noted that the new addition will be framed with 2 inch by 6 inch framing lumber, which
53 will allow for better insulation. There will be R-19 installed in the walls and R-38 in the ceiling. Breuhaus
54 noted that the current DPW building needs a new roof and new siding, and this creates an opportunity to
55 re-side and roof the building at the same time the addition is being built. Breuhaus pointed out that there
56 would be a consistency in the roofing and siding, which might make it more appealing to the
57 neighborhood. Breuhaus noted that the roof would be a beige color and the siding would be brown,
58 comparable to the color of the current DPW building. Breuhaus noted that the siding and the roofing
59 would be metal.

60 Breuhaus stated that the lights on the exterior will be metal halite, and lights built in to the
61 canopy's over the door which point in a downward fashion. Breuhaus noted that the lights on the exterior
62 would be similar to the new Verizon building next to the Town of Lansing Highway Department. Tomei
63 asked if there would be more light pollution for the neighbors towards St. Joseph Lane. Breuhaus stated
64 that since the fixtures will be directing light down, he didn't think that any more light would be polluting
65 the neighborhood.

66 Breuhaus stated that the construction will be disturbing less than 1 acre, but will still have to take
67 precautions with sediment and erosion control because of the closeness of the stream. Courtney added that
68 they will produce a photometric plan and supply that to the Village of Lansing Lighting commission.
69 Courtney noted that he would like a little more light for security reasons. Hickey asked what the distance
70 was to the property line from the front of the building. Breuhaus stated that it is approximately 80-90 feet.
71 Cross asked if the lights were to be installed on the salt storage building and pointed north if that might be
72 acceptable. Courtney pointed out that between the salt storage building and the trees on the south side,
73 which are pine trees and don't lose their buffering ability in the winter, the light should have less of a
74 possibility to trespass onto the neighboring properties. Courtney added that the trees on the north side lose
75 their leaves and buffering ability, which would allow the light to trespass onto the neighboring properties.
76 Tomei asked if there were any lights proposed for the north side of the building. Breuhaus noted that there
77 will not be any lights on the north side. Hickey asked if the light pack farthest to the west was eliminated
78 would all the lights then be blocked by the salt shed. Breuhaus noted that the goal was to obtain even
79 lighting on the face of the DPW garage.

80 Breuhaus noted that if there were plantings under the existing pine trees that they would not grow
81 very well due to the lack of sun exposure. Dubow noted that there is a recommendation to the Planning
82 Board in the area variance granted the night before by the BZA (Board of Zoning Appeals) for some kind
83 of visual buffer or screening to be required. Breuhaus explained that a fence would be the best option for
84 both the neighbors and the DPW. Breuhaus added that there is one house in particular that needs to have
85 a visual barrier from the new addition. Hickey noted that someone needs to work with the neighbors and
86 the Village DPW on the building site to see what type of buffer works well, and at what angle the buffer
87 should be placed to be most effective. Dubow noted that if such a condition were to be included as part of
88 the special permit approval, the approval should designate someone on behalf of the Village to be
89 responsible for signing off on the buffer. Vaczek agreed that the best way to figure out the
90 fencing/buffering dilemma would be to have a meeting with the neighbors. Dubow suggested that the
91 Zoning Officer might be the most appropriate individual to sign off on the buffer.

92 Vaczek noted that the radiant floor is a great idea. Vaczek asked what the price would be for the
93 new addition. Breuhaus noted that he didn't know exactly and his best guess would be around \$300,000-
94 \$350,000. With no one else to speak, Durst moved to close the public hearing. Seconded by Stycos. Ayes
95 by Stycos, Dankert, Durst, Tomei and Schleelein.

96 Dubow noted that SEQR (State Environmental Quality Review Act) review must be completed
97 and indicated that a short form EAF (Environmental Assessment Form) was submitted with the special
98 permit application, Part I having been completed by the applicant. Cross noted that this does not require a
99 storm water permit, but needs to have a plan for sediment and erosion control. Cross stated that the site
100 engineer should produce a statement that would reflect that the runoff is not significant and will not need
101 to have a storm water plan. Cross noted that the specs for the oil and water separator specifications should
102 be supplied to the Village of Cayuga Heights for review.

103 Tomei explained that the Planning Board will review and fill in the appropriate areas of the Short
104 EAF. Part II of the Short EAF was completed by the Planning Board as follows:

105 A DOES ACTION EXCEED ANY TYPE I THRESHOLD IN 6 NYCRR, PART 617.4? If yes,
106 coordinate the review process and use the FULL EAF. No

107
108 B. WILL ACTION RECEIVE COORDINATED REVIEW AS PROVIDED FOR UNLISTED ACTIONS
109 IN 6 NYCRR, PART 617.6? If No, a negative declaration may be superseded by another involved
110 agency. No

111
112 C. COULD ACTION RESULT IN ANY ADVERSE EFFECTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE
113 FOLLOWING: (Answers may be handwritten, if legible)

114 C1. Existing air quality, surface or groundwater quality or quantity, noise levels, existing traffic pattern,
115 solid waste production or disposal, potential for erosion, drainage or flooding problems? Explain
116 briefly: NO

117
118 C2. Aesthetic, agricultural, archaeological, historic, or other natural or cultural resources; or community
119 or neighborhood character? Explain briefly: NO

120
121 C3. Vegetation or fauna, fish, shellfish or wildlife species, significant habitats, or threatened or
122 endangered species? Explain briefly: NO

123
124 C4. A community's existing plans or goals as officially adopted, or a change in use or intensity of use of
125 land or other natural resources? Explain briefly: NO

126
127 C5. Growth, subsequent development, or related activities likely to be induced by the proposed action?
128 Explain briefly: NO

129
130 C6. Long term, short term, cumulative, or other effects not identified in C1-C5? Explain briefly:
131 NO

132
133 C7. Other impacts (including changes in use of either quantity or type of energy)? Explain briefly:
134 NO

135
136 D. WILL THE PROJECT HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS
137 THAT CAUSED THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A CRITICAL
138 ENVIRONMENTAL AREA (CEA)?

139 NO

140
141 E. IS THERE, OR IS THERE LIKELY TO BE, CONTROVERSY RELATED TO POTENTIAL
142 ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS?

143 NO

144

145 Based upon the foregoing completion of Part II of the Short EAF and the resolution adopted by the
146 Planning Board as set forth below, Part III of the Short EAF was completed as follows:
147

148 **PART III - DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE** (To be completed by Agency)

149 **INSTRUCTIONS:** For each adverse effect identified above, determine whether it is substantial, large,
150 important or otherwise significant. Each effect should be assessed in connection with its (a) setting (i.e.
151 urban or rural); (b) probability of occurring; (c) duration; (d) irreversibility; (e) geographic scope; and (f)
152 magnitude. If necessary, add attachments or reference supporting materials. Ensure that explanations
153 contain sufficient detail to show that all relevant adverse impacts have been identified and adequately
154 addressed. If question D of Part II was checked yes, the determination of significance must evaluate the
155 potential impact of the proposed action on the environmental characteristics of the CEA.
156

157 Check this box if you have identified one or more potentially large or significant adverse impacts
158 which **MAY** occur. Then proceed directly to the FULL EAF and/or prepare a positive declaration.

159 Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above and any
160 supporting documentation, that the proposed action **WILL**
161 **NOT** result in any significant adverse environmental impacts **AND** provide, on attachments as necessary,
162 the reasons supporting this determination.
163

164 The following proposed SEQR Resolution was moved by Dankert and seconded by Durst:
165

166 **VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SEQR REVIEW OF**
167 **SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 2495 ADOPTED ON AUGUST 18, 2010**
168

169 **WHEREAS:**
170
171

- 172 A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Special Permit 2495,
173 The Village of Lansing Department of Public Works, to construct a 4000 square foot addition
174 on the current Department of Public Works garage in the Commercial Low Traffic District,
175 Tax Parcel No. 45.2-1-46.10. Because the DPW garage addition is being constructed in the
176 Commercial Low Traffic District, Special Permit review is required pursuant to Section 145-
177 42D(1) of the Village of Lansing Code; and
178
- 179 B. This proposed action is an Unlisted Action for which the Village of Lansing Planning Board
180 is an involved agency for the purposes of environmental review; and
181
- 182 C. On August 18, 2010, the Village of Lansing Planning Board, in performing the lead agency
183 function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance with
184 Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental
185 Quality Review Act ("SEQR"), (i) thoroughly reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment
186 Form (the "Short EAF"), Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with
187 respect to this proposed action and its environmental review (including any Visual
188 Environmental Assessment Form required), (ii) thoroughly analyzed the potential relevant
189 areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant
190 adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section
191 617.7(c), and (iii) completed the Short EAF, Part II;
192

193 **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:**
194

- 195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
1. The Village of Lansing Planning Board, based upon (i) its thorough review of the Short EAF, Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review (including any Visual Environmental Assessment Form required), (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 Short EAF, Part II, 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 neither a Full Environmental Assessment Form, nor an Environmental Impact Statement will be 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 Short EAF, Part III, confirming the foregoing **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, which fully completed and signed Short EAF shall be attached to and made a part of this Resolution.

212 The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

213

214 AYES: Mario Tomei, Lisa Schleelein, Richard Durst, Phil Dankert, and Maria Stycos

215

216 NAYS: None

217

218 The motion was declared to be carried.

219

220 Dubow noted that as part of any approval of the special permit the conditions to be imposed by
221 the Board should be set forth. In addition, the Board was advised that the general conditions for all special
222 permits must be reviewed to confirm that all such conditions have been met. Tomei read the general
223 conditions for a special permit which are as follows:

224 No Special Permit will be granted by the Planning Board or the Board of Trustees unless the
225 requested activity meets the following requirements.

226 (1) It will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare.

227 (2) It will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the vicinity or neighborhood.

228 (3) It will not impede the orderly development of the vicinity or neighborhood and is appropriate in
229 appearance and in harmony with the existing or intended character of the vicinity or neighborhood.

230 (4) The street system and off-street parking facilities can handle the expected traffic in a safe and efficient
231 manner.

232 (5) Natural surface water drainageways are not adversely affected.

233 (6) Water and sewerage or waste disposal facilities are adequate.

234 (7) The general environmental quality of the proposal, in terms of site planning, architectural design
235 and landscaping, is compatible with the character of the neighborhood.

236 (8) Lot area, access, parking and loading facilities are sufficient for the proposed use.

237 (9) The requested use or facility conforms in all other respects to the applicable regulations of the district
238 in which it is located.

239 (10) The applicant has shown that steps will be taken where necessary to meet all performance standards
240 and all other applicable general regulations.

241

242 Durst moved to accept the general conditions as being met for special permit # 2495. Seconded
243 by Stycos, Ayes by Stycos, Dankert, Durst, Tomei and Schleelein.

244
245 The following proposed special permit approval resolution was moved by Schleelein and seconded by
246 Stycos:

247
248 **VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SPECIAL PERMIT NO.**
249 **2495 ADOPTED ON AUGUST 18, 2010**

250
251 **WHEREAS:**

- 252
253 A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Special Permit 2495,
254 The Village of Lansing Department of Public Works, to construct a 4000 square foot addition
255 on the current Department of Public Works garage in the Commercial Low Traffic District,
256 Tax Parcel No. 45.2-1-46.10. Because the DPW garage addition is being constructed in the
257 Commercial Low Traffic District, Special Permit review is required pursuant to Section 145-
258 42D(1) of the Village of Lansing Code; and
- 259
260 B. On August 18, 2010, the Village of Lansing Planning Board held a public hearing regarding
261 this proposed action, and thereafter reviewed and analyzed (i) the materials and information
262 presented by and on behalf of the applicant in support of this proposed action, including
263 information and materials related to the environmental issues, if any, which the Board
264 deemed necessary or appropriate for its review, (ii) all other information and materials
265 rightfully before the Board, and (iii) all issues raised during the public hearing and/or
266 otherwise raised in the course of the Board's deliberations; and
- 267
268 C. On August 18, 2010, the Village of Lansing Planning Board determined that the proposed
269 action is an Unlisted Action for which the Board is an involved agency, and in performing the
270 lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in
271 accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the
272 State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"), the Board (i) thoroughly reviewed the
273 Short Environmental Assessment Form (the "Short EAF"), Part 1, and any and all other
274 documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental
275 review (including any Visual Environmental Assessment Form required), (ii) thoroughly
276 analyzed the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed
277 action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria
278 identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), (iii) completed the Short EAF, Part 2; and (iv) made
279 a negative determination of environmental significance ("Negative Declaration") in
280 accordance with SEQR for the above referenced proposed action and determined that an
281 Environmental Impact Statement would not be required; and
- 282
283 D. On August 18, 2010, in accordance with Section 7-725-b of the Village Law of the State of
284 New York and Sections 145-59, 145-60, 145-60.1 and 145-61 of the Village of Lansing
285 Code, the Village of Lansing Planning Board, in the course of its further deliberations,
286 reviewed and took into consideration (i) the general conditions required for all special permits
287 (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-59E), (ii) any applicable conditions required for certain
288 special permit uses (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-60), and (iii) any applicable
289 conditions required for uses within a Combining District (Village of Lansing Code Section
290 145-61);

291
292 **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:**
293

294
295 1. The Village of Lansing Planning Board hereby finds (subject to the conditions and
296 requirements, if any, set forth below) that the proposed action meets (i) all general conditions
297 required for all special permits (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-59E), (ii) any
298 applicable conditions required for certain special permit uses (Village of Lansing Code
299 Section 145-60), and (iii) any applicable conditions required for uses within a Combining
300 District (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-61); and

301
302 2. It is hereby determined by the Village of Lansing Planning Board that Special Permit No.
303 2495 is **GRANTED AND APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions and
304 requirements:

- 305
306 1. There will need to be fencing installed to break the visual plane for the
307 affected St. Joseph's Lane neighbors, the specific fencing and its location to
308 be subject to the Village of Lansing Zoning Officer's approval.
309 2. A lighting plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Village of Lansing
310 Lighting Commission.
311 3. An erosion and sediment control plan shall be submitted to and approved by
312 the Village of Lansing Engineer
313 4. Specifications for the installation of the oil and water separator shall be
314 submitted to the Village of Cayuga Heights for compliance with their sewer
315 use regulations.

316
317 The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

318
319 AYES: Mario Tomei, Lisa Schleelein, Richard Durst, Phil Dankert, and Maria Stycos

320
321 NAYS: None

322
323 The motion was declared to be carried.

324 **Sewer Easement at Bolton Estates**

325
326 Courtney asked who would be absorbing the cost of the extra parts and pieces associated in order
327 to have the sewer line follow the newly proposed sewer easement location for Lot 11 of the Bolton
328 Estates Subdivision. Dubow noted that will be the Village's responsibility to install the sewer line if and
329 when that opportunity exists and is exercised by the Village. Courtney explained that the configuration
330 has changed from the original which in turn makes for 2 additional manholes in the future and more areas
331 for infiltration to occur. Cross explained that the original proposal would have resulted in a sewer main
332 that was 13' deeper than normal, which is usually 3'-5' deep. Cross stated that he was not comfortable
333 knowing that the future sewer main would have to be close to 20' in the ground, which is most likely
334 bedrock. Cross pointed out that the new proposal reduces the depth of the sanitary sewer to only 5' deeper
335 than normal, and is a reasonable improvement over the previously proposed 13' deeper. Courtney stated
336 that he was astonished that someone would come to the Village and ask for a redesign of a newly
337 developed sewer easement. Dubow noted that the tradeoff is to have the developer reserve and convey the
338 sewer easement now as opposed to later when it may be more difficult. Courtney explained that the way
339 that the easement is designed might make it more difficult for the DPW to work on. Dubow noted that
340 there will eventually be easement documents that will be supplied to the Village and which should
341 address those types of issues. Dankert moved to accept the revised sewer easement location for Lot 11 as

342 a minor amendment to the subdivision. Seconded by Durst. Ayes by Stycos, Dankert, Durst, Tomei and
343 Schleelein.
344

345 **Senior Housing Discussion/Lansing Meadows PDA**

346 Bold noted that the senior housing component of the Lansing Meadows PDA has been altered and
347 redesigned to have 12 separate units, instead of 9 separate units and a 3 unit building. Bold noted that the
348 houses are all approximately 1200 square feet with the same layout, but they all look different on the
349 exterior. Bold stated that each of the units is 25 feet in width. Bold explained that most of the units have
350 garages, and if a car were to be parked in the garage then one car would be able to be parked in the
351 driveway. Bold noted that the units that don't have as much parking area do have access to auxiliary
352 parking. Bold noted that some of the units might have a basement, but that will be determined at a later
353 point in time. Bold noted that the plan for one of the pedestrian connections has been altered as well. Bold
354 proposed that the new pedestrian connection be in the road right of way in front of the Fire Department,
355 and then connect to the existing emergency fire access road. The connection would continue up the
356 emergency fire access road and connect to the back of the BJ's back delivery road. Bold noted that there
357 is a possibility of making the delivery road into a one way road and decreasing the width. Schleelein
358 asked if only delivery trucks would be using the road. Goetzmann agreed that the only use would be for
359 delivery trucks. Tomei asked if there would be a designated area for the pedestrians on the delivery road.
360 Bold noted that the delivery road could be striped close to the guardrail to indicate where the pedestrians
361 should walk. Dubow noted that Cross should look over the plans and sign off on the design.

362 Durst asked why there is opposition with building a trail over the wetlands and connecting
363 between the Y.M.C.A and the proposed BJ's store. Bold noted that there would need to be an easement
364 granted for the trail from the Y.M.C.A and there is a large grade change in that area. Bold noted that there
365 would also be a necessity for an additional swale to catch the storm water that currently runs off of the
366 Y.M.C.A property.

367 Hickey stated that yearlong maintenance should be considered. Dubow noted that the Village
368 does maintain sidewalks, but generally does not maintain trails in the winter. Hickey stated that the
369 Village does maintain some trails in the winter time but only if they are paved.

370 Dankert asked what the next step is. Bold noted that the engineering associated with the site plan
371 needs to be finished, which includes both the sewer and water lines, and the finalization of some
372 construction documents also needs to be finished. Bold noted that the building/land use/special permit
373 form has been completed and handed off to the Code/Zoning Officer, along with the check for the fees.
374 Bold asked if the long form is needed for the senior housing. Dubow explained that it would make sense
375 to follow the procedure used for the SEQR review of the commercial component of the PDA whereby the
376 developer could submit a letter or other written document identifying changes made from the previous
377 Full EAF that was completed as part of the SEQR review of the full PDA project.

378 Tomei asked if the project financing has been finalized. Bold noted that they are still working on
379 it, and by having a plan for the senior housing it is one step closer. Bold stated that the utility letters have
380 been met and he will hand those off to Moseley. Dubow asked if the plan was to still only have one phase
381 for construction of both the commercial and residential components of the PDA. Bold agreed. Bold stated
382 that there might be a need to obtain a variance from the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals for a
383 front yard setback.

384 Bold noted that with the pitch of the roof the building heights for the senior housing will be fairly
385 tall for a single story residential house. Schleelein asked how the units would be heated. Bold stated that
386 they would be natural gas. Bold noted that they have looked at other options for heating but are not sure if
387 the infrastructure that would be needed would be available in a timely fashion.

388 Dankert asked if the lighting plan for BJ's will be available for the Lighting Commission to
389 review. Bold noted that there is a new standard that is not published yet, which he would like to share
390 with the Lighting Commission. Bold stated that the new standard is a combination of the Dark Sky
391 Institute and the Society of Illuminating Engineers. Bold recommended that the Lighting Commission

392 should institute a more formal set of lighting regulations. Bold stated that if anyone would like to look at
393 the new standard they can go to www.darksky.org.

394 **Approval of Minutes**

395 Schleelein moved to approve the minutes of June 29, 2010. Seconded by Dankert. Ayes by Stycos,
396 Dankert, Tomei and Schleelein. Durst Abstained

397

398 **Reports**

399 *Trustees* – Stycos reported on the Board of Trustees meeting on August 2. Stycos stated that Patricia
400 O'Rourke will fill the vacant trustee position at this point in time. Stycos noted that Jodi Dake will
401 manage the website for the Village, and Moseley will be taking over the fire inspections for the Village.
402 Stycos stated that people are driving around the gate at the bottom of Blackchin Boulevard, and that there
403 will be large rocks placed in the problem areas by the owner. Stycos explained that the paving will begin
404 soon in the Village, the water tank will be demolished next year, and there will be a new office building
405 built for the Village. Stycos noted that there is no asbestos in or on the water tank. Stycos stated that the
406 Trustees are working on updating the emergency preparedness plan, which is mandated by the State.

407 **Adjournment:**

408 Durst moved to adjourn at 9:20 P.M. Seconded by Stycos. Ayes by Stycos, Dankert, Durst, Tomei and
409 Schleelein.

410