

**Village of Lansing
Planning Board Meeting
February 22, 2011**

1 The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:34 P.M. by Chairman Mario
2 Tomei. Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members, Phil Dankert, Maria Stycos, and Lisa
3 Schleelein; Alternate Board Member Jonathan Kanter; Trustee Lynn Leopold; Code Enforcement Officer
4 Marty Moseley; Park Grill Café Owners Levon Brewer and Joan Pike; Residents Paul Kim, Soomee Kim,
5 Nora Shang, Phil Miller, Yasamin Miller, and Ulises Mejias; and Community Party Observer Carla
6 Marceau.

7
8 Tomei appointed Kanter as an acting member for the meeting due to the absence of Planning Board
9 member Richard Durst.

10
11 **Public Comment Period**

12 Tomei opened the public comment period. Mrs. Miller explained that she had some questions
13 that pertained to the proposed Lansing Reserve affordable housing project. Tomei asked if she and the
14 neighbors had received an invitation from the Mayor to attend the Board of Trustees March 7th meeting,
15 which would be for all concerned residents pertaining to the Lansing Reserve project. Ms. Miller
16 indicated that she had received the letter and planned to attend. She asked if the Planning Board had a
17 chance to look at the application made by NRP Group to the New York State Homes of Community
18 Renewal (NYSHCR), which is the state funding agency involved in the Lansing Reserve project. Tomei
19 noted that the Planning Board has not seen the application and this process is in the hands of the
20 Trustees. Ms. Miller urged the Planning Board to read some of the information submitted by NRP Group.
21 She noted that in attachment D.1., which was prepared by GAR Associates, it states that “A discussion
22 with the town’s code enforcement officer indicated that the subject is proposed as a townhouse cluster
23 development, which is allowable in the zoning district. It has been assumed that the developers will
24 receive site approval to construct the townhouse complex as intended.” Ms. Miller indicated that she
25 assumed that the “town code enforcement officer”, as indicated in the above statement, is in reference
26 to the Village Code Enforcement Officer who is Marty Moseley. She noted that, if she was a grant
27 officer, this would imply that the Village will approve the development. She asked Moseley if he could
28 reconstruct the discussion that he had with GAR Associates. Moseley indicated that he did not
29 remember having a conversation with the company in question. Moseley added that he had a
30 discussion with the funding agency, to which he supplied a letter clarifying some issues. Moseley asked
31 Ms. Miller if she had the letter to which he was referencing. She indicated that she had the letter in
32 question. She asked if Moseley believed that GAR Associates was fabricating the information. Moseley
33 asked Ms. Miller if there was a specific person that was referenced as the contact person. Miller noted
34 that if the Village has been misquoted, then a follow up conversation would be appropriate. Mrs. Miller
35 read “It has been assumed that the developers will receive site approval to construct the townhouse
36 complex as intended”. Kanter noted that the sentence that was constructed was very likely based on
37 their interpretation at that time. Tomei added that GAR Associates made the assumption. Tomei
38 explained that this is the first time that any of the Planning Board members had seen the application in
39 question. Moseley noted that there was only one person who contacted him from the funding agency,
40 to whom he then e-mailed the appropriate contact information for the funding agency via e-mail to Ms.
41 Miller. Ms. Miller noted that on page 30 of the attachment D.1, there was a conclusion drawn which
42 stated: “The property has adequate access and the topography of the site allows for residential
43 development. The site is basically ready for development with all utilities available at the road and

44 zoning allowing for multi-family development. The subject parcel in question will be adequate to
45 accommodate the proposed 65 multi-family unit development.” Tomei asked if this text was still
46 prepared by GAR Associates. Ms. Miller indicated that it was.

47 Ms. Miller noted that on the application, page 16 indicated that the Village of Lansing had
48 contributed one hundred and ninety seven thousand and twenty three dollars (\$197,023) to the project.
49 Tomei indicated that he was unaware of the so called contribution from the Village to the project.
50 Kanter explained that the Village did not fill out any of the documents that were submitted to the
51 funding agency, but the developer has filled out these documents and these answers are based on their
52 interpretation or lack thereof. Ms. Miller stated that she wanted to clarify these issues and put them on
53 the record. She noted that on page 40 of the application, section 3, Development and Approval
54 Timetables, stated that Moseley is the contact person, and the status on the “Planning Board/Site Plan
55 Approvals” is pending, but has a completion date of March 2011. She asked if the Planning Board had
56 given confirmation that the approval process will be complete by March 2011. Tomei indicated that
57 there has been no statement from the Planning Board pertaining to the Lansing Reserve project being
58 granted approvals by March 2011. Ms. Miller added that the application indicates that the PILOT and tax
59 abatement is pending and the Mayor is in charge of that aspect, which will be granted approval by May
60 2011. She noted that the developer had inserted dates into the categories that she feels are not
61 appropriate unless the Village had indicated that the approvals will happen at a certain point in time.
62 She also noted that the developer indicated that the completion date for the building permit would be
63 August 2011. She inquired if the Planning Board had a timeline of when they will be reviewing the
64 application, when the developer will get the approvals, and when the developer will achieve the final
65 approvals. Tomei indicated that they don’t have a timeline. Tomei added that at this time the process
66 for the proposed Lansing Reserve is at the Board of Trustees level and they have not approved anything
67 that he is aware of. Ms. Miller asked if the Planning Board will have any authority in the Planned
68 Development Area (PDA) process. Tomei noted that if the Trustees decide to go forward with review of
69 the proposed development it doesn’t necessarily mean that any authorization will be granted. Tomei
70 added that the Planning Board is simply an advisory board to the Trustees through the PDA process. Ms.
71 Miller stated that the Village has been saying that they have no timeline for the completion of the
72 review process. She noted that she has been trying to obtain a timeline from the Village but keeps
73 getting the same answer. She wanted confirmation on the Planning Board not having a timeline for the
74 completion of any review process at this point in time, not knowing if the Planning Board will or will not
75 take any action regarding the development at this point in time. Tomei agreed. Dankert noted that the
76 Trustees will issue the final decision in the PDA process. Ms. Miller urged the Planning Board to look
77 over the application that was submitted by the developer to the funding agency. She noted that NRP
78 Group will make 1.7 million dollars of profit off of the development, and the lender for the development
79 will make a seven percent (7%) return over the next forty (40) years. Tomei asked for any other
80 comments. Tomei noted that the general public is invited to the Board of Trustees March 7th meeting.
81 Dankert asked if all the parties at the meeting received the invitation, by e-mail, from the Mayor. All
82 neighbors that were present indicated that they had received the e-mail. With no one else to speak,
83 Dankert moved to close the public comment period. Seconded by Schleelein. Ayes : Tomei, Dankert,
84 Stycos, Schleelein and Kanter.

85 **Further Discussion of 145-60(N)**

86 Tomei noted that Kanter, Moseley and he had a meeting with Tom LiVigne, who is the director
87 of the Cornell Real Estate department, to discuss the proposed changes in the regulations and make

88 sure that Cornell had no opposition to the changes. Tomei explained that the Planning Board would
89 work through each proposed change. Tomei stated that the first change is in section 145-82, which
90 would be amended to read as follows:

91 **(39) Employee cafeteria food and beverage service. Food service provided for only the**
92 **employees (and their guests, clients, customers, etc.) of the building where such service is**
93 **located (which building is being used for a permitted use).**

94 Dankert asked if any individual could walk in and obtain food from this use. Tomei stated that this is a
95 cafeteria not a low traffic food and beverage use, and the cafeteria use would not be open to the public
96 only the employees of that particular building. Schleelein noted that this would be inserted into this
97 section therefore ultimately adding one definition to the section. Tomei asked for a motion to
98 recommend the amendment to the Board of Trustees. Kanter moved that the Planning Board
99 recommend the amendment, in question, to the Board of Trustees. Seconded by Schleelein. Ayes:
100 Tomei, Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein, and Kanter.

101 Tomei noted that the next proposed change is in section 145-60(N), which would be amended
102 to read as follows:

103 N. Low Traffic Food and Beverage in Business and Technology District **[Added 9-10-2003**

104 **by L.L. No. 3-2003]**

- 105
- 106 *(a) Food and beverage services shall be permitted subject to the following conditions:*
- 107 *(1) There shall be no more than four (4) Low Traffic Food and Beverage service uses*
108 *located within the Business and Technology District,*
- 109 *(2) Such food and beverage service use shall be located within and operated from a*
110 *building in the Business and Technology District and shall not occupy more than two*
111 *thousand (2,000) square feet.*
- 112 *(3) Such food and beverage service area may provide no more than fifty (50) interior or*
113 *exterior on-site seating, and shall be prohibited from the sale of alcoholic beverages.*
- 114 *(4) No signage of any kind for such food and beverage service area shall be allowed, unless*
115 *approved in the special permit application for the business by the Village of Lansing, on*
116 *the outside of any building or at any other location within the Business and Technology*
117 *District for advertising, identification or other purposes. [If such business is located*
118 *within the Cornell Business and Technology Park, said business shall comply with the*
119 *Cornell Business and Technology Park Planned Sign Area provisions.]*
- 120 *(5) There shall be no more than two (2) interior identification signs permitted. One (1) shall*
121 *be allowed at the entrance to the space occupied by such food and beverage service*
122 *provider and one (1) shall be permitted in a window which will be no larger than four*
123 *(4) square feet. Signage shall conform in all respects to the signage standards for such*
124 *building.*
- 125 *(6) Such food and beverage service area shall be open for business only during the regular*
126 *business hours of those businesses located within the Business and Technology District,*
127 *and under no circumstances shall be open earlier than 7:00 A.M. or later than 6:00*
128 *P.M.*

129 (7) *Any such food and beverage service provider shall be allowed to accept orders for food*
130 *and beverages to be picked up or delivered, and shall be further allowed to visit*
131 *buildings with food carts and similar mobile apparatus intended for the delivery of*
132 *permitted food and beverage products.*
133

134 Tomei pointed out that in the current code this section has an (a) and a (b), and the proposed code
135 change would eliminate the current (a) and be replaced with new wording. Tomei noted that there are
136 already three (3) low traffic food and beverage uses located within the Business and Technology District
137 (BTD) which are the Park Grill Café, the Marriott Hotel, and the Tompkins County Airport Café. Tomei
138 explained that Tom LiVigne did not want to completely restrict the development of low traffic food and
139 beverage uses. Kanter noted that the way section 145-60(N) is being proposed is more permissive than the
140 current wording.

141 In reference to item number two (2), Tomei noted that the Park Grill Café is approximately eighteen
142 hundred (1800) square feet. Dankert pointed out that this requirement currently, permits a low traffic food
143 and beverage use to occupy a maximum of five (5) percent of the main building. Stycos added that, if
144 approved, the Village would be allowing a larger use for low traffic food and beverage than what is
145 permitted at this point in time, which might be too much. Moseley pointed out that the food prep area, the
146 kitchen area, the sales area, and the seating area are all within the proposed two thousand (2000) square
147 feet.

148 In reference to item three (3), Tomei asked Brewer what the maximum capacity for seating was at
149 the Park Grill Café. Brewer noted that it was below fifty (50), even with the outside seating in the warmer
150 months. Schleelein asked if the Marriott Hotel would be affected by the new requirement for prohibiting
151 the sale of alcoholic beverages. Moseley explained that topic should have been incorporated in their special
152 permit for their low traffic food service use. Marceau stated that she works in the B&T Park and noticed
153 that the Marriott only serves breakfast, which would probably not include the sale of any alcoholic
154 beverage. Marceau asked why the Village would want to restrict the low traffic food and beverage use.
155 Tomei noted that the Village does not want the B&T District to turn into a restaurant corridor. Marceau
156 stated that from a perspective of a person who works in the B&T Park, she would encourage any restaurant
157 to be located within the B&T Park. Moseley explained the Village has restrictions in place, currently, for a
158 low traffic food and beverage use located within the BTD that are more restrictive. Moseley added that the
159 proposed amendments that are being discussed would liberalize the requirements for that particular
160 section. Marceau noted that Cornell could have some reasoning why they might want to restrict certain
161 businesses, but does not understand the reasoning for the Village restrictions. Dankert stated that the
162 original intent of section 145-60(N) was not to damage the business for other restaurants that were located
163 in the Village like The Rose or Applebee's. Leopold added that the Village has tried to keep the correct uses
164 within the designated districts in the Village, and the B&T Park was not originally formed for the purpose of
165 a restaurant or a café.

166 In reference to item four (4) and the amendment to the B&T Park PSA, Tomei noted that a special
167 permit would be required in order to be allowed to erect any signs. Schleelein asked what an interior sign
168 would consist of. Tomei noted that an "OPEN" sign or the name of the business would be considered an
169 interior identification sign. Brewer indicated that there were two interior identification signs installed at the
170 Park Grill Café, which are located on the entrance door and in a window facing Thornwood Drive.

171 In reference to item six (6), Tomei noted that the opening time was proposed to change from eight
172 (8) a.m. to seven (7) a.m. because most people are at work by eight (8) a.m. Schleelein asked if the times
173 are applicable to the Tompkins County Airport food service. Moseley indicated that it would apply because

174 the restrictions are in the BTB which includes the B&T Park. Marceau stated that some people would like to
175 be able to eat at five (5) a.m. when they have just landed at the airport. Tomei noted that the Park Grill Café
176 would be open to the general public unlike the Marriott's food service. Tomei asked Moseley for
177 clarification on the operation hours of the other low traffic food and beverage uses in the BTB.

178 In reference to item seven (7), Tomei indicated that this requirement would allow catering services.
179 Leopold asked if the Planning Board was going to restrict where there could be catering. Moseley explained
180 that item seven (7) originally restricted where this particular use could cater. Tomei noted that the Planning
181 Board had been trying to be less restrictive and this would allow for catering in more areas of the Village,
182 like in the Human Health Services District. Brewer stated that the Park Grill Café does receive orders from
183 the health campus.

184 Brewer asked if the proposed sign amendment had addressed the issue of the sign at the entrance
185 of the Park Grill Café and the directional signs along Brown Road and Warren Road. Tomei indicated that
186 there is another proposed amendment that specifically deals with those issues which would potentially be
187 inserted into the B&T Park PSA (Planned Sign Area).

188 Kanter moved that 145-60(N) be recommended to the Board of Trustees subject to clarification on
189 item six (6). Seconded by Dankert. Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein, and Kanter.

190 Tomei noted that the next proposed amendment is in section 145-44(C), which would be amended
191 to read as follows:

192
193 C. Permitted uses with additional conditions. Permitted uses with additional conditions shall be as follows:

194 *(1) Employee cafeteria food and beverage service*

195
196 Tomei noted that the "Employee cafeteria food and beverage service" use would be added under item C.
197 Moseley stated that would allow for a cafeteria use to be allowed without obtaining a special permit.
198 Moseley added that this would be subject to the additional conditions which are located in section 145-58,
199 which deal with issues like parking.

200 Stycos moved that the Planning Board recommend the proposed amendment to section 145-44 to
201 the Board of Trustees. Seconded by Schleelein. Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein, and Kanter.

202 Tomei noted that the next proposed amendment is to the B&T Park PSA, which would be amended
203 to read as follows:

204
205 *(1) No signage of any kind for such food and beverage service area shall be allowed along*
206 *Warren Road or New York State Route 13. Such food and beverage service use shall be*
207 *allowed three (3) directional signs within the Business and Technology Park with*
208 *approval from both the Cornell Business and Technology Park and the Village of*
209 *Lansing Board of Trustees. One parcel number and name sign shall be permitted near*
210 *the driveway exit/entrance for the building in which such food and beverage service*
211 *use business is to be located.*

212
213 Tomei stated that the Park Grill Café would be permitted to have the three (3) directional signs that are
214 currently installed and they would be permitted to have a sign at the entrance of their parking lot, which is
215 the parcel and name sign. Tomei noted that the wording has changed from what was included in the
216 packets for the Planning Board members because it sounded as if one of the three (3) directional signs was
217 to be the parcel number and name sign. Moseley stated that he incorporated language from the B&T Park
218 PSA for better clarification.

219 Brewer asked if there was a specific reason for not allowing any signs on Warren Road or Route 13.
220 Tomei explained that if the Park Grill Café was to be allowed to install a directional sign along Warren Road
221 or Route 13, it could be a possibility that other businesses would want to install the same type of signs in
222 the same locations. Leopold asked if the Marriott Hotel had installed signs on Warren Road. Schleelein
223 indicated that they have two signs on Warren Road. Leopold asked if the Marriott Hotel signs are allowed.
224 Moseley indicated that they are not and he had brought the issue to the attention of the Board of Trustees
225 in the same letter that informed the Trustees about the Park Grill Café signs and the CIAO! Restaurant sign.
226 Moseley added that he had not heard how the Trustees wanted to handle the Marriott signs. Leopold noted
227 that the Marriott signs need to be discussed by the Trustees. Moseley indicated that the picture that was
228 submitted to the Trustees included both the Park Grill Café sign and the Marriott Hotel sign on one sign
229 post. Schleelein noted that since the hotel borders Route 13 a person might find the signs useful in the
230 middle of the night. Dankert stated that the topic should be revisited because of equality. Marceau stated
231 that during College graduation time there would be more of a necessity for people to find the hotels in
232 the area. Marceau added that most of the individuals staying at the hotels and motels in the area do not
233 live in this area and might find difficulty in finding some of the hotels in the area. Brewer asked if
234 Moseley had directed the Tompkins County Highway Department to remove the sign that was located in
235 the Town of Ithaca. Moseley indicated that he had a discussion with the Tompkins County Highway
236 Department and specifically stated that the sign in question was outside of the Village of Lansing
237 jurisdiction. Pike asked who removed the signs. Moseley indicated that Tompkins County Highway
238 removed the signs. Brewer noted that they are being asked to pay for the signs that have been removed
239 and would like to have the signs in their possession. Leopold noted that the Tompkins County Highway
240 Department would probably have the signs. Moseley added that the Village does not have the signs in
241 question.

242 Brewer asked that this amendment not be recommended to the Trustees until such time that
243 the Marriott signs have been discussed by the Trustees. Brewer added that he feels that the “Big Box
244 Stores” are looked at in a different way than the locally owned and operated stores in the Village. Tomei
245 indicated that the Village does not differentiate between businesses. Brewer stated that he feels that if
246 the Marriot Hotel is allowed to have signs along Warren Road then the Park Grill Café should have the
247 same right. Schleelein noted that if the Park Grill Café signs were allowed to be installed, then anyone in
248 the B&T Park could want a directional sign installed on Warren road. Schleelein stated that she would
249 agree with Marceau on the fact that a hotel is a different occupancy because people check in at all hours
250 of the night. Schleelein added that she was concerned with allowing directional signs since the Park Grill
251 Café does have restricted hours. Schleelein added that a person might be misled to think that the café
252 would be open because of the directional signs, when in fact they could be closed. Schleelein noted that
253 she agreed with Leopold about the Marriot signs. Schleelein noted that the only sign that has been
254 erected in the Village right of way was the Homewood Suites Hotel sign. Leopold stated that only
255 happened because the hotel received approval from the New York State Department of Transportation
256 to install a way finding sign in the State right of way. Leopold added that, if needed, the Village can have
257 the hotels way finding sign removed at any time for multiple reasons.

258 Marceau asked what the Village of Lansing can do to help a small business in the B&T Park.
259 Marceau added that there are a lot of people who work in the B&T Park that would like a service like the
260 Park Grill Café is offering. Tomei explained that the Planning Board is loosening the original restrictions
261 for the low traffic food and beverage use; therefore, the Village is trying to encourage a low traffic food

262 and beverage use. Tomei added that the Village cannot promote one use over another. Marceau
263 pointed out that there have been several individuals that have tried to be successful with a food service
264 use in that particular building, but they all have failed, including Cornell. Leopold stated that the owners
265 and operators of that business need to market their product. Pike noted that signage is a major part of
266 marketing for any business. Leopold explained that it is not up to the Village to market for the
267 businesses. Leopold added that this is an unusual place for a restaurant, and there are different
268 guidelines and rules for that particular area. Leopold stated that the café is not located in a typical area,
269 like along Triphammer Road where a restaurant can easily be seen. Leopold added that the Village is
270 trying to find a balance between being too restrictive and being too lenient. Stycos asked Marceau what
271 would be helpful for a low traffic food and beverage business in the B&T Park. Marceau indicated that a
272 sign out in front of the business so people can find the restaurant would be helpful. Stycos asked if there
273 was any way to spread the word about businesses, like restaurants. Marceau explained that even
274 though it is the Cornell B&T Park the companies are separate, so there really is no way to effectively
275 spread the word about restaurants like the Park Grill Café. Tomei read from the current section 145-
276 60(N), which reads:

277 *Low Traffic Food and Beverage in Business and Technology District [Added 9-10-2003*
278 *by L.L. No. 3-2003]*

279 *Food and beverage services shall be prohibited except:*

280 *(a) Employee cafeteria food and beverage service within a building (which building is being used*
281 *for a permitted use) serving employees at that building only shall be permitted; and*

282 *(b) Additional food and beverage service shall be permitted subject to the following conditions*
283 *and restrictions:*

284 *(1) Food and beverage service use shall be provided only to occupants of the buildings*
285 *located within the Business and Technology District, including employees of the*
286 *businesses located in such district.*

287 *(2) Such food and beverage service use shall be located within and operated from a*
288 *building in the Business and Technology District and shall not occupy more than five (5%)*
289 *of the gross square foot area of any such building.*

290 *(3) Such food and beverage service area may provide limited on-site seating*

291 *(4) No signage of any kind for such food and beverage service area shall be allowed on*
292 *the outside of any building or at any other location within the Business and Technology*
293 *District for advertising, identification or other*

294 *(5) purposes. Interior identification signage shall be permitted only at the entrance to*
295 *the space occupied by such food and beverage service provider, which signage shall*
296 *conform in all respects to the signage standards for such building.*

297 *(6) Such food and beverage service area shall be open for business only during the*
298 *regular business hours of those businesses located within the Business and Technology*
299 *District, and under no circumstances shall be open earlier than 8:00 A.M. or later than*
300 *6:00 P.M.*

301 *(7) Any such food and beverage service provider shall be prohibited from mailing or*
302 *otherwise disseminating flyers, menus, brochures or any other advertising outside of the*
303 *confines of the Business and Technology District.*

304 *(8) Any such food and beverage service provider shall be allowed to accept orders for*
305 *food and beverages to be picked up by or delivered to occupants (including employees)*
306 *of the buildings within the Business and Technology District, and shall be further allowed*
307 *to visit buildings within the Business and Technology District, with food carts and similar*
308 *mobile apparatus intended for the delivery of permitted food and beverage products.*
309

310 Tomei noted that, under the proposed amendments, the Park Grill Café can now have the general public
311 instead only the B&T Park employees, the food service could potentially be larger than previously
312 stated, the onsite seating has been increased, signage is now allowed, the hours of operation have been
313 increased, and the food service is now allowed to send flyers or menus to other businesses. Tomei
314 added that the Village is working on their part to try to help the business, and it is now time for the
315 business owners to market their product.

316 Kanter asked if the Village did allow any signage along Warren Road or maybe one could be
317 allowed at the entrance of Brown Road but still located along Warren Road. Brewer noted that he would
318 agree with Kanter's statements. Brewer added that delivery truck drivers have had difficulties finding his
319 business. Brewer indicated that he would be happy to forget about the signs along Warren Road if there
320 could be one located at the entrance of the Brown Road. Tomei asked if the sign that Brewer is
321 proposing would be located on Brown Road facing west towards Warren Road but not on Warren Road.
322 Brewer indicated that might not work effectively and it would need to be in the same location as the
323 Marriott Hotel sign that is close to the Brown Road and Warren Road intersection. Dankert noted that
324 the sign that is being proposed would only direct traffic flow driving north. Kanter explained that if any
325 signs were to be allowed along Warren Road the Village would need to be very careful in where the
326 signs were to be located. Stycos noted that once a delivery truck driver is at the business once then he
327 or she should remember the way again.

328 Kanter moved that the Planning Board recommend the B&T Park PSA amendment in question,
329 with comments from the Planning Board. Seconded by Stycos. Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein,
330 and Kanter.

331 Tomei noted that the final proposed amendment is in section 145-58(D) which would be amended
332 to read as follows:

333
334 *D. Employee Cafeteria food and beverage service. Permitted as alteration to building or improved*
335 *site subject to the conditions as required in § 145-58B above.*
336

337 Dankert moved that the Planning Board recommend the proposed amendment in question to
338 the Board of Trustees. Seconded by Schleelein. Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein, and Kanter.
339

Approval of Minutes

None

Reports

340
341 *Trustees-Tomei reported on the February 7th Trustee meeting (and for a more in depth*
342 *report, please see the minutes of that meeting).* Tomei reported that the Trustees were informed of
343 carts that have accumulated along Dart Drive and become a nuisance and a danger. Schleelein asked if
344 the Planning Board should look into a law about the containment or littering of shopping carts. Moseley
345 noted that it would be up to the Planning Board if they would like to recommend a law for that
346

347 particular subject. Leopold indicated that the carts are a continuing problem in the Village. Tomei noted
348 that the Sign Law and Zoning Law curb cut amendments were passed by the Trustees. Tomei noted that
349 Mayor Hartill has kept the tax levy lower than the inflation rate, and the Village will finish the Dart
350 Drive storm sewer this coming fiscal year.

351 **Other Business**

352 The Planning Board recapped the public comment period for Leopold. Tomei noted that he had
353 incorporated an article in the packets for the members from the Planning Commissioners Journal. Tomei
354 encourages the members to read it if they have not done so at this point in time. Stycos asked about
355 continuing education for the Planning Board. Moseley indicated that he was trying to set up an
356 educational meeting on Storm Water Management. Schleelein noted that she would like to see an
357 educational meeting on lighting.

358 **Adjournment:**

359 Stycos moved to adjourn at 9:00P.M. Seconded by Dankert. Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Stycos,
360 Schleelein, and Kanter.