

**Village of Lansing  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 9, 2011**

1           The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:32 P.M. by  
2 Chairman Mario Tomei. Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Phil Dankert, Maria  
3 Stycos, and Lisa Schleelein; Alternate Board Member Jonathan Kanter; Trustee Lynn Leopold; Code  
4 Enforcement Officer Marty Moseley; Village Attorney David Dubow; Guest Speaker; Mike Smith;  
5 Residents Phil and Yasamine Miller, Bill and Nora Shang, Anders Ryd, Mihyming Wu, Asma Barlas,  
6 Ulises Mejias, Dong Yoon Kim, Nick Vaczek, and Lowell Garner; Liz Frisbie and Andrew Rosen from  
7 the Northwoods Apartment Complex ; and Community Party Observer Robert Schleelein.

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

11  
12 **Public Comment Period**

13 Tomei opened the public comment period. Robert Schleelein introduced himself as the Community Party  
14 Observer for the evening. With no one else to speak, Dankert moved to close the public comment period.  
15 Seconded by Stycos Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein and Kanter.

16 Tomei explained that the agenda item for the Temporary Commercial Activity has been re-scheduled for  
17 the next Planning Board meeting (May 31, 2011). He also indicated that, unless there were any  
18 objections, he would like to have the Lansing Reserve PDA moved up to the next agenda matter. There  
19 was no objection.

20  
21 **Lansing Reserve PDA Discussion and Update**

22           Tomei explained that the Board of Trustees has formally referred the proposed Lansing Reserve  
23 PDA to the Planning Board for a more in depth review and recommendation as provided in the Village's  
24 PDA provisions. Tomei noted that the Planning Boards role, at this point in time, is to make sure that the  
25 developer has submitted a complete and proper preliminary proposal. Tomei pointed out that the Trustees  
26 listed a number of concerns that were attached to their referral of the proposed PDA. Tomei stated that  
27 the four Village Trustees are Julie Baker, John O'Neill, Pat O'Rourke and Lynn Leopold. Tomei noted  
28 that Baker was concerned about access issues, a buffer between the proposed Lansing Reserve and the  
29 existing neighbors, the bus stop on Dart Dr. , and if property values would be affected by the proposed  
30 PDA. Tomei added that O'Neill indicated that the traffic issue should be the first item that should be  
31 addressed, and the Lansing Reserve individuals should be in contact with the Northwoods apartment  
32 owners to discuss the issue. Tomei noted that O'Rourke is in agreement with O'Neill and Baker. Tomei  
33 explained that Leopold emphasized the idea of increasing the buffer width, agreed that the biggest  
34 obstacle is the traffic and access issues, and that keeping some of the property forever wild is a great asset  
35 to the Village and the neighborhood. Tomei added that the possible reconfiguration of the development  
36 would need to be looked at, in a collaborative effort, by both the Village Engineer and the developers'  
37 Engineer. Tomei added that traffic ingress and egress is the largest issue at this time. Tomei noted that  
38 Leopold was worried about the future impact on the other parcels of land to the east and west and the  
39 impact this could have on the neighboring roads. Tomei stated that the property owners should be  
40 responsible for creating a road system that would be adequate for sustaining the development's ingress  
41 and egress. Mrs. Miller noted that the forever wild land that is being proposed in the development and

42 would only benefit the Dart Drive property owners and not the Coventry Walk property owners. Mrs.  
43 Miller noted that Leopold talked about some of the species in the woods. Leopold indicated that she was  
44 talking about some of the wetland plant species that are in the woods, and the woods are not high quality  
45 and are fairly new. Rosen asked if there had been concerns raised on how the proposed low income  
46 housing development could negatively impact property values in the area. Tomei indicated that there has  
47 been some concern about property values expressed. Mrs. Miller stated that this is low income housing  
48 and the Village should not play games with words. Dubow noted that this is a proposed affordable  
49 housing project pursuant to a program that is initiated at both the State and Federal level. Mrs. Miller  
50 noted that this project has not been initiated at the State level, and asked if the project had been funded  
51 yet.

52 Tomei asked for the Board comments first and then the public. Dankert noted that the Trustees  
53 captured some good points with their concerns. Dankert agreed that the ingress and egress for the  
54 development is a key concern. Dankert noted that he is a resident of Dart Drive, and that the people that  
55 are along Dart Drive are fortunate to have the proposed forever wild area buffer them from the proposed  
56 development. Dankert asked Mrs. Miller if she indicated in a letter, to the New York State Homes and  
57 Community Renewal, that the owners of the Northwoods apartment complex have no interest in selling or  
58 converting their ingress and egress to a public road. Mrs. Miller indicated that that was her understanding.  
59 Stycos is concerned about the ingress and egress and it seems to be a major hurdle. Stycos noted that if  
60 Dart Road was to be closed off at the easterly end at some point in time and the Northwood road that is in  
61 question was to remain private, then there would be more issues. Stycos questioned if it could be a  
62 possibility to open vehicle access directly to Warren Road through the other parcels of land, but that  
63 option would need to be looked at by an engineer. Stycos added that she does not see how this particular  
64 development would be able to be built with the present situation of no public access. Stycos noted that the  
65 forever wild area is a great benefit for the community and the Village. Tomei stated that the vehicle  
66 access issue should be the responsibility of the developer, who may have to contact the other property  
67 owners to the east or west to determine the best way to solve the issue. Dankert stated that the developer  
68 would have limited choices of the access points due to a stream that runs through the property. Kanter  
69 agreed with Tomei that the developer is ultimately responsible for solving the access issues, but it is the  
70 Village's responsibility to only allow development of all three Dart parcels that would benefit the Village  
71 and its residents. Kanter noted that the traffic analysis should indicate how to best coordinate the traffic  
72 from all three parcels if they were to be developed. Kanter added that the storm water management plan  
73 will be a key issue that should include all the properties and not just one property. Tomei added that there  
74 should be an engineering study that would indicate how the other parcels of land were to be affected by  
75 the proposed development. Leopold noted that this situation is a planning nightmare because the Village  
76 does not know what will become of the other properties which are all part of the same drainage area.

77 Mrs. Miller asked if the Board has had a chance to read over the letter that she and others  
78 submitted to the Village. Mrs. Miller added the residents have addressed some major concerns in their  
79 letter, and hoped that the Planning Board will take the issues that were raised seriously. Mrs. Miller noted  
80 that the Village has more rental units than any other area in Tompkins County (per square foot), and  
81 wondered if there was a reason for the Village encouraging more rental units. Mrs. Miller added that the  
82 Village already has affordable housing and the data that was supplied to the Village is unequivocal. Mrs.  
83 Miller asked if that would be something that the Planning Board would take into consideration. Tomei  
84 explained that the Village has not been encouraging the NRP group to develop affordable housing units.  
85 Tomei added that the NRP group has come to the Village and proposed this development, which is why  
86 the Planning Board and Board of Trustees will be evaluating the project to see if it would benefit the  
87 Village. Mrs. Miller asked if the proposed PDA was contingent on the State approving the funding for the  
88 development. Mrs. Miller added that the developer has not obtained funding for the proposed PDA, and  
89 wondered why the Village was moving forward with something that may or may not be approved for

90 funding. Mrs. Miller stated that it looks less likely that this development will obtain any funding from the  
91 State. Mrs. Miller asked why the Village was spending time and resources on the project at this point in  
92 time. Tomei explained that the developer has indicated another funding source, and he was not sure of the  
93 details and validity of that particular comment from the developer. Tomei added that it looks as if the  
94 Village Boards will have to deal with this issue, and the Planning Board is just trying to prepare for what  
95 may happen. Mrs. Miller asked what the other funding alternative was. Tomei indicated that he was not  
96 sure. Dubow explained that the NRP group indicated that they have a bonding or borrowing alternative.  
97 Mr. Miller asked if the bonding would be public money and if the borrowing would be private money.  
98 Dubow indicated that he did not know any of the specifics at this point in time. Kanter noted that if the  
99 funding were to change, that might change the criteria for individuals who would be renting. Kanter  
100 added that the Planning board should pass along that question to the NRP group. Mrs. Miller asked if the  
101 Planning Board would delay the process until the final funding source was to be revealed. Mrs. Miller  
102 noted that she did not like the fact that her Village representatives are working on a project that may or  
103 may not be approved.

104 Dubow stated that the Board of Trustees has asked the Planning Board to evaluate the project,  
105 and the dialogue with the developers is intended to obtain as much information as possible so that the  
106 Planning Board can make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. Dubow noted that the Planning  
107 Board could refer this to the Trustees with a set of conditions under which the PDA authorization might  
108 be recommended, or it may issue a written summary explaining why they recommend that the process  
109 should not proceed, but the Planning Board cannot make a determination if it is not allowed to work  
110 through the correct steps in the review process. Dubow added that Appendix A-2 is written this way so it  
111 is fair to all parties involved in the PDA process. Dubow explained that a developer has the right to  
112 initiate a proposal, with respect to a re-zoning of a piece of property, under the PDA regulations. Dubow  
113 added that the only way to evaluate a PDA proposal for the Board of Trustees to see if it would be  
114 beneficial to the Village is if the Planning Board has worked through a preliminary process of review.  
115 Dubow noted that the way it is set up in the PDA provisions is if the Trustees make the initial indication  
116 that they would like to learn more about the project on the table, they then delegate authority to the  
117 Planning Board to start to gather information. Dubow noted that all of the questions that have been raised  
118 are good ones, and it is the job of the Planning Board to try to obtain the answers to questions so they can  
119 provide the Board of Trustees with some guidance based on those answers. Dubow noted that the funding  
120 and the review processes are done in tandem and it would be difficult for the developer to obtain funding  
121 on a project that may change due to the desires and requirements of the Village Boards. Dubow added  
122 that all parties involved need to give the project an opportunity to work through the correct procedures.  
123 Leopold commended Mrs. Miller for the amount of research that was provided to the Village. Leopold  
124 noted that she has not had the time to fully look through the letter and materials that Mrs. Miller and  
125 others submitted to the funding agency and discuss it with other Board members.

126 Mrs. Miller stated that she could answer any question that the Board members might have for  
127 her. Tomei noted that if the Planning Board was not allowed to review any proposals, then they could not  
128 make any intelligent decisions to possibly determine if a proposal would benefit the Village or not. Mrs.  
129 Miller asked if the Trustees would have to abide by the Planning Board's recommendation. Tomei  
130 indicated that the Trustees could ultimately decide against the Planning Board's recommendation.  
131 Leopold noted that the Trustees would, most likely, not vote against the Planning Board's  
132 recommendation. Dubow noted that the Board of Trustees always has the right to re-zone a piece of  
133 property on their own initiative. Dubow added that the Trustees have chosen not to re-zone, at this point  
134 in time, because the PDA provisions provide an alternate process where everyone has an opportunity to  
135 participate and determine if and how such PDA re-zoning might create a beneficial result. Dubow pointed  
136 out that the Village Comprehensive Plan has numerous references for different types of housing,  
137 including affordable housing, and creative ways to include open space. Dubow noted that the terms

138 “affordable housing” and “workforce housing” on the one hand and “low income housing” on the other  
139 are different terms that define different levels of housing. Dubow added that the Village’s Comprehensive  
140 Plan and the Tompkins County Comprehensive Plan both include references for different levels of  
141 housing to be developed. Rosen asked if it would be a good idea for the Village to have a better  
142 understanding of the different levels of housing that were mentioned for this particular development.  
143 Dubow asked if Rosen has seen the preliminary proposal that had been submitted to the Village, because  
144 it explains in some detail the various eligible income levels, how they are determined, and what their  
145 proposal is for their current funding source. Dubow encouraged everyone in attendance to review the  
146 preliminary PDA proposal and read through the document so as to achieve a better understanding of the  
147 proposed PDA components. Rosen asked if Dubow or the Board has taken the time to compare what is  
148 available in the current market to what is being proposed, and how the project would relate to the  
149 community. Dubow indicated that is one of the aspects that the initial review by the Village would  
150 presumably address. Wu asked what the timeline was for the recommendation from the Planning Board to  
151 the Trustees. Tomei indicated that, at this point in time, there is no timeline because the Planning Board  
152 needs to look at the proposal and make sure that all the information is correctly completed. Tomei added  
153 that after the proposal is deemed complete, then a timeline begins. Dubow noted that the Planning Board  
154 has an unlimited amount of time to determine if the proposal is complete. Wu asked when people should  
155 express their concerns about the development, including the concerns that have been brought up this  
156 evening. Dubow noted that after the Planning Board deems the proposal complete, the Planning Board  
157 will then, within 45 days, hold a developer’s conference. Dubow added that the developer’s conference  
158 would include prior notification to the contiguous property owners, and incorporates the availability of  
159 public information as well. Dubow pointed out that the public information period is the key point in time  
160 where the developer, the public and the Village Board will all be in the same place at one time, and this is  
161 where the concerns should hopefully be discussed in a collective way, but “whatever happens, happens”  
162 in terms of the various parties being able to pursue the intended collaborative process. Wu asked if they  
163 should write out all their concerns. Dubow noted that there is nothing that precludes anyone from  
164 submitting comments or information to the Village at any point in time.

165 Barlas asked to what extent does the public comment matter. Tomei indicated that the public  
166 participation matters a great deal. Barlas noted that she was concerned with Dubow’s statement “whatever  
167 happens, happens”. Dubow explained that the developer’s conference with the public information period  
168 is the one time and place that the developer, the Board, and the public are in the same place at the same  
169 time, so that would be the opportune time to ask questions and possibly get answers. Dubow added that  
170 the answers may not satisfy anyone or everyone, but it does give an opportunity for all parties to hear all  
171 of each other’s concerns and possibly get some answers. That is the most important part of the process at  
172 this stage of review. Dubow noted that after the developer’s conference, the Planning Board would then  
173 make some sort of preliminary determination based on the information that they have acquired. Barlas  
174 explained that Mayor Hartill is on record promising to write a letter to the (NYHCR) New York State  
175 Homes and Community Renewal agency addressing all of the misleading information that the NRP group  
176 had supplied to them in their application for funding. Dubow indicated that Mayor Hartill has written a  
177 letter to the NYHCR. Mrs. Miller noted that she has not seen it at this time. Dubow stated that everyone  
178 has the right to request information from the Village, but it would be impossible for the Village to make  
179 sure that all information was given to everyone involved in the process. Barlas noted that the people who  
180 want the information gave their names and not everyone in the Village is interested in the project. Barlas  
181 noted that the people in the audience this evening are the ones who are interested. Barlas added that if  
182 Mayor Hartill cannot honor his word, people then become skeptical about what matters to the Village.  
183 Tomei noted that the issues that have been raised so far do matter to the Village. Tomei explained that  
184 Dubow’s statement of “whatever happens, happens” means that if the developer’s conference/public  
185 information period turns out to be a cooperative process, that is okay; and if there is a non-cooperative  
186 meeting, that’s okay as well. Tomei added that whatever type of meeting the Village has, they will use it

187 to gather information and input from all involved parties. Tomei stated that the Board members are all  
188 part of the Village too, and it is not the general public versus the Village Boards. Mrs. Miller noted that  
189 she appreciates hearing Tomei's comments. Tomei noted that the Board is not rushing to provide a final  
190 answer for the NRP Group, but rather to make a preliminary determination as to whether it would be a  
191 benefit for the Village to have this proposed PDA move forward. Mr. Miller noted that they are all tax  
192 payers, and the NRP Group is not and is located in Ohio.

193 Kim asked what the difference was between the current meeting and other meetings. Tomei noted  
194 that the Trustees formally referred the PDA proposal to the Planning Board, and now the Planning Board  
195 will formally look through the proposal and determine if it is correct and complete. Tomei added that the  
196 Planning Board will eventually, either positively or negatively, recommend the PDA proposal to the  
197 Trustees. Tomei noted that at any point in time the Trustees can determine that no further action would be  
198 needed for the PDA proposal. Schleelein stated that the Trustees would like the Planning Board to look  
199 further into the matter to determine if the project would be a benefit to the Village. Mejias asked if anyone  
200 had a copy of the letter that Mayor Hartill wrote, and could he request a copy of the letter. Dubow  
201 indicated that he should contact the Village Clerk tomorrow to obtain a copy. Ryd noted that Dubow  
202 indicated that the Village was waiting for more information before acting on the proposal, but it sounded  
203 as if there was enough information to act on the proposal. Tomei noted that the Planning Board will  
204 determine if the correct amount of information was supplied to the Planning Board to deem the proposal  
205 complete. Dubow indicated that there were still some items with respect to which developer needs to  
206 provide further information, some of which, such as flora and fauna studies, that could be done now due  
207 to improved weather conditions. Dubow added that the PDA process is a fluid process in which the  
208 Planning Board and the developer work together to develop answers to the Planning Board in order for  
209 them to make a decision pertaining to the future of the proposal. Ryd asked when the 45 days would start.  
210 Dubow indicated that it would start after the Planning Board determined that the proposal was complete.  
211 Garner noted that the Trustees indicated that the Planning Board has the ability to attach recommended  
212 conditions to the proposal, to which the developer agrees or disagrees. Garner added that the developer  
213 would then need to meet all conditions that were agreed upon in order to be able to proceed further with  
214 the proposed PDA. Garner asked if the conditions, that might be attached, would be applied prior to the  
215 45 day period. In an effort to accurately and fully describe the process, Dubow read Appendix A-2 of the  
216 Village Code/Zoning Law, sections 4, 5, & 6, which read:

- 217  
218 *Appendix A-2 Section 4. Preliminary proposal.*  
219 *A. Any developer proposing a PDA shall submit his or her written request to the Board of*  
220 *Trustees, with a copy to the Planning Board at the same time, in the form of a preliminary*  
221 *proposal, which must include:*  
222 *(1) A sketch development plan showing existing and proposed land uses,*  
223 *the approximate locations of proposed buildings and other*  
224 *improvements, existing and/or proposed buffers, existing and*  
225 *proposed open spaces, existing topographic characteristics, the*  
226 *approximate location of current and proposed streets and easements,*  
227 *any property proposed to be dedicated to the Village, and the existing*  
228 *land uses immediately adjacent to the proposed PDA.*  
229 *(2) A written description and explanation of the character and purpose of*  
230 *the proposed PDA, including the type and density of any residential*  
231 *and non-residential development proposed; estimated building sizes*  
232 *and heights; estimated parking space requirements; proposed*  
233 *vehicular ingress and egress locations; proposed water and sewage*  
234 *systems and infrastructure; a general statement of proposed financing*

235 of the project; an indication of the expected timetable and phasing for  
236 development; the manner in which phasing of the development will  
237 be controlled so that simultaneous development of different project  
238 elements will be in reasonable proportion to one another; and the  
239 proposed amount and type of performance guaranty and/or financial  
240 security to be provided by the developer.

241 (3) Preliminary information regarding environmental issues likely to be  
242 addressed in the environmental review of the PDA, which  
243 environmental review will be required for all PDA proposals,  
244 together with a preliminarily prepared Part 1 of a Full  
245 Environmental Assessment Form in accordance with the applicable  
246 provisions of the State Environmental Quality Review Act under  
247 Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law and the  
248 implementing regulations codified in Section 617 of Title 6 of the  
249 New York Code of Rules and Regulations (SEQRA).

250 (4) A written description of proposed permitted uses within the PDA  
251 (and any related requirements therefor), proposed lot sizes, proposed  
252 lot setbacks, proposed lot coverage restrictions and other proposed  
253 dimensional and zoning district type regulations.

254 (5) A written statement and explanation as to the differences between the  
255 proposed PDA and what would otherwise be permitted to be  
256 developed in the proposed PDA under the current provisions of this  
257 Chapter 145, and why the proposed PDA would be of benefit to the  
258 Village as a whole.

259 B. Upon receipt of a preliminary proposal for a proposed PDA, the Board of Trustees shall  
260 review such proposal (jointly and/or in consultation with the Planning Board if the Board of  
261 Trustees deems it appropriate and/or necessary) to determine if it wishes to proceed further with  
262 the consideration of the proposed PDA. If the Board of Trustees determines that further  
263 consideration is appropriate, the proposed PDA shall be referred by the Board of Trustees to the  
264 Planning Board for more in depth review and consideration and for the purpose of the Planning  
265 Board providing the Board of Trustees with its input and possible recommendations. Such in  
266 depth review and consideration shall include the Planning Board's authority to require  
267 submission of supplemental information and materials by the developer to complete the  
268 preliminary proposal.

269 Section 5. Developer's conference.

270 Within forty-five (45) days after the Planning Board has determined at a duly held meeting that a  
271 complete preliminary proposal has been properly submitted together with a fee of two hundred  
272 fifty dollars (\$250.00), the Planning Board shall hold a developer's conference with the  
273 developer to review the proposed PDA. The Village shall send written notice by mail to all  
274 owners of Village property contiguous to the boundaries of the property under consideration.  
275 Such notice shall state the nature of the proposed PDA and developer's conference, the time and  
276 place of the conference and such additional information as shall be deemed appropriate by the  
277 Planning Board. In addition thereto, the Village Planning Board shall publish a legal notice  
278 providing that such developer's conference shall also serve as a public information session with  
279 respect to the proposed PDA, which notice shall likewise state the time and place of the  
280 conference and the same additional information as provided in the notice to the contiguous  
281 property owners. Such notice to the contiguous property owners shall be mailed no less than ten  
282 (10) days prior to the developer's conference and publication of the Village Planning Board's  
283 legal notice shall likewise be published no less than ten (10) days prior to the developer's  
284 conference. If it is determined following the developer's conference and any additional review

285 *and deliberation undertaken by the Planning Board that the preliminary proposal seems to be in*  
286 *accordance with general planning objectives for the area and the intent and objectives of this*  
287 *Appendix A-2, the Planning Board and developer shall thereupon jointly consider the conditions*  
288 *and specifications under which the Planning Board might recommend further action by the Board*  
289 *of Trustees, which conditions and specifications shall be reduced to writing by the Planning*  
290 *Board.*

291 *Section 6. Further action by the Planning Board.*

292 *A. If after the developer's conference and the further deliberation by the Planning Board*  
293 *agreement cannot be reached as to conditions and specifications under which the Planning*  
294 *Board might recommend further action by the Board of Trustees, the Planning Board shall within*  
295 *thirty (30) days thereafter recommend to the Board of Trustees that no further action on the*  
296 *proposed PDA be taken. Such recommendation shall include a summary of the Planning Board's*  
297 *findings with respect to its determination.*

298 *B. If, after the developer's conference, the further deliberation by the Planning Board, and the*  
299 *establishment of conditions and specifications under which the Planning Board might commend*  
300 *further action by the Board of Trustees, the developer wishes to proceed with the PDA proposal,*  
301 *the developer shall submit to the Planning Board a written statement of intent to comply with the*  
302 *conditions and specifications as established. In such case, upon receipt and acceptance by the*  
303 *Planning Board (at a duly held meeting) of the developer's written statement of intention, the*  
304 *Planning Board shall, within thirty (30) days thereafter, forward to the Board of Trustees its*  
305 *recommendation (i) to proceed further with consideration of the proposed PDA in accordance*  
306 *with the developer's statement of intent and (ii) to consider such legislative/zoning action as the*  
307 *Board of Trustees may deem appropriate to establish the proposed PDA. Such recommendation*  
308 *shall include:*

309 *(1) A statement as to the effect of the proposed PDA on (i)*  
310 *the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and this Chapter*  
311 *145 and (ii) the character of the neighborhood.*

312 *(2) A statement of the conditions, specifications and*  
313 *requirements upon which agreement has been reached with*  
314 *the developer and which the developer will be obligated to*  
315 *abide by in developing the proposed PDA.*

316 *(3) The developer's statement of intent to comply with the*  
317 *required conditions and requirements.*

318 *(4) The amount and type of performance guaranty and/or*  
319 *financial security which the Planning Board believes*  
320 *developer should be obligated to provide.*

321 *(5) Such other information and/or materials that the Planning*  
322 *Board determines will be helpful to the Board of Trustees in*  
323 *its deliberations as to the proposed PDA and whatever*  
324 *legislative/zoning action the Board of Trustees may*  
325 *undertake, including, but not limited to, information and/or*  
326 *materials relevant to the environmental review of the*  
327 *proposed PDA.*

329 Dubow noted that all interested parties should obtain a copy of the Village Code Appendix A-2 so  
330 they can familiarize themselves with the PDA provisions. Dubow added that this process involves a  
331 lengthy, deliberative, comprehensive and detailed evaluation of the proposed PDA. Dubow noted that this  
332 will ultimately allow the Planning Board to make a decision based on the facts that derive from the PDA  
333 process. Tomei noted that the conditions attached to any recommended PDA authorization would need to

334 be completed and satisfied prior to or in conjunction with the permitting process. As an example, Tomei  
335 stated that the Lansing Meadows PDA had 18 conditions to be satisfied, the completion of which has  
336 involved a very lengthy period. Mrs. Miller noted that it would be highly unlikely that this project would  
337 receive the New York State funding, because one of the conditions for the funding was from the time that  
338 the application was approved the developer had to prove that they would be “shovel ready” within 4  
339 months from the date of the approval. Dubow stated that if that is correct, it would be highly unlikely that  
340 they would get approval for the current round of funding from the State. Dubow added that the developer  
341 could very well submit the proposed project as part of subsequent rounds of funding. Mrs. Miller asked if  
342 the Village would request the developer to provide additional information regarding the alternate source  
343 of funding it might have since it would be helpful for everyone to know and it might alter the type of  
344 housing or number of units. Dubow noted that the developer would very likely be at the next Planning  
345 Board meeting where that question could be asked. Mrs. Miller asked the Planning Board to look at the  
346 letter and appendices that she sent to the funding agency and to the Board members. Mr. Miller noted that  
347 a lot of the concerns that were discussed earlier in the meeting by the Board members, independent of the  
348 lengthy document that the residents provided, support each other. Mr. Miller added that if the Board  
349 members read the documents that were provided they would understand what the concerned residents  
350 were talking about.

351 Mrs. Miller asked if the developer would need to supply the Village with an environmental study.  
352 Dubow indicated that a Long (Full) Environmental Assessment Form would need to be completed.  
353 Dubow added that Part 1 of the Full EAF needs to be filled out by the developer and an initial version has  
354 been submitted. Dubow noted that the lead agency, presumably the Board of Trustees, would ultimately  
355 look at what the developer filled out and decide whether or not it is sufficient or accurate. Dubow stated  
356 that the Board of Trustees will fill out the second part of the Full EAF with assistance from the Planning  
357 Board. Tomei noted that the Planning Board members should look at Appendix A-2, Sections 4 through  
358 6, and also the Lansing Reserve proposal, for guidance and background.

359

### 360 **Lighting Ordinance Continuing Education**

361 Tomei introduced Mike Smith, who is an Environmental Planner for the Town of Ithaca. Tomei  
362 added that Smith will be giving the presentation to the Planning Board pertaining to Lighting  
363 Code/Ordinance. Smith brought a power point presentation and information that he gathered while doing  
364 research for the Town of Ithaca Lighting Ordinance. Smith gave a one hour presentation that included a  
365 question and answer time.

366 Schleelein asked about LED (light-emitting diode) lights and how they were regulated in the  
367 Town of Ithaca. Smith noted that the lighting ordinance regulates by way of the lumens from the light.  
368 Kanter added that for the most part all LED lights, for signs, are prohibited in the Town of Ithaca sign  
369 ordinance. Tomei asked if there were many people that complain about the lack of safety because of the  
370 lighting ordinance. Smith indicated that they have not received many calls associated with that type of  
371 concern. Leopold asked if the Village Lighting Commission would be drafting proposed lighting  
372 provisions and presenting them to the Planning Board for review and ultimate referral to the Trustees.  
373 Leopold noted that John Courtney (a member of the Lighting Commission) would like a lighting code to  
374 refer to when performing plan reviews. Schleelein asked if the Town’s lighting ordinance needed to be  
375 improved in any way since it has been in effect in the Town of Ithaca. Smith noted that, so far, the  
376 ordinance is working effectively and efficiently. Smith added that the Town held information sessions and  
377 mailed out information about the new ordinance to all electricians in the phonebook to help transition into  
378 having a lighting ordinance.

379 **Approval of Minutes**

380 Stycos moved to accept the April 11<sup>th</sup> minutes as reviewed and revised. Seconded by Kanter.  
381 Ayes by Tomei, Dankert, Schleelein, Stycos, and Kanter.

382 **Reports**

383 *Trustees- Schleelein reported on the May 2<sup>nd</sup> Board of Trustees meeting (for a more in depth*  
384 *report, please see the minutes of that meeting).* Schleelein noted that the Trustees referred the Lansing  
385 Reserve PDA proposal to the Planning Board. Schleelein added that the Trustees scheduled a public  
386 hearing for the Illicit Discharge Local Law and Proposed Local Law E regarding amendments to the low  
387 traffic food and beverage use provisions in the Business and Technology District. Schleelein noted that  
388 there was a discussion about the encroachment from a resident's property onto Village property by way of  
389 a fence and a shed. Schleelein noted that the Trustees held an organizational meeting at which they  
390 appointed Stycos and Kanter to the Planning Board and Mary Sirois and Dolores Adler to the Board of  
391 Zoning Appeals. Schleelein added that the new Village office design is in the beginning stages.

392 **Other Business**

393 Tomei noted that the Planning Board should look at the Lansing Reserve PDA proposal before  
394 the next Planning Board meeting. Dubow added that the Village's Comprehensive Plan should be looked  
395 at as well. Tomei stated that at the next Planning Board meeting there will be another continuing  
396 education opportunity for the Planning Board members, and that presentation will be on Storm Water  
397 Management provided by Darrel Sturges.

398 Leopold asked if the Village had been able to contact anyone from the Solomon organization  
399 about the Northwoods Road entrance and exit. Dubow indicated that the Village had made contact with  
400 the company with further conversations hopefully to follow.

401 **Adjournment**

402 Dankert moved to adjourn at 9:49P.M. Seconded by Stycos. Ayes by Tomei, Dankert, Schleelein,  
403 Stycos, and Kanter.