

**Village of Lansing  
Planning Board Meeting  
July 9, 2012**

1 The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:33 P.M. by Chairman  
2 Mario Tomei.

3 Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Maria Stycos, Lisa Schleelein, and Phil  
4 Dankert; Alternate Member Jon Kanter; Code Enforcement Officer Marty Moseley; Village Attorney  
5 David Dubow; Trustee Liaison Julie Baker; Dave Banfield; Frankie Lechner; Carol Chaplin, and Scott  
6 Steelman; Boris Simkin representing Westview Partners; and Community Party Representative Stu  
7 Grinnell.

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

10

11 **Public Comment Period**

12 Tomei opened the public comment period.

13 With no one wishing to speak Dankert moved to close the public comment period. Seconded by  
14 Schleelein; Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein, and Kanter  
15

16 **Public Hearing to Consider:**

17 Tomei opened the public hearing for;

18 Final Plat approval of the Westview Partners, LLC. Subdivision, a minor subdivision by Westview  
19 Partners LLC. to divide one 2.917 acre lot into one 1.529 acre lot and one 1.388 acre parcel, known  
20 as 1654 East Shore Drive, pursuant to the provisions of Section 125-6 of the Village of Lansing  
21 Code. The parcel is located in the Low Density Residential District, Tax Parcel Number 42.1-1-2.

22 Simkin, who represents Westview Partners LLC., entered the meeting at this point in time.

23 Tomei noted that Simkin presented the sketch plan of a similar map when Simkin asked the  
24 Planning Board to classify the subdivision at the April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2012 Planning Board meeting.

25 Lechner asked what was presented to the Planning Board at the previous meeting with respect to  
26 the Simkin subdivision.

27 Moseley indicated that Lechner had picked up the application materials previous to this meeting,  
28 which included the map that was supplied to all Planning Board members and which represented how  
29 Simkin wanted to divide his property on both sides of Sun Path Road.

30 Tomei noted that this requested approval is for a subdivision of the property, which could be built  
31 on but might not be built on. Tomei noted that part of this meeting is to make sure that Simkin turns in all  
32 the correct paperwork that is required by the Village to review a subdivision application.

33 Lechner asked what the correct paperwork was.

34 Moseley noted that the materials are confirmation of mailings that were sent out to the contiguous  
35 property owners, which was how Lechner was made aware of the Planning Board topic, and the proposed  
36 final plat that the Planning Board can either approve or deny. Moseley added that if approved, the  
37 applicant would then supply a final survey, stamped by a licensed surveyor, that would then be signed by  
38 a representative from the Village and filed with the Tompkins County Clerk's Office.

39 Lechner asked if Simpkin would be required to inform the Board and public of what he would  
40 like to build on those parcels of land.

41 Moseley indicated that normally the applicant would not be required to disclose any information  
42 with respect to what they were planning to build. Moseley added that in some instances a single family  
43 home would be subject to Special Permit review, but not always.

44 Lechner asked if Simkin decided to build a different structure on the lot, would it be allowed.

45 Moseley indicated that the lots would only be allowed to have a single family home built on them  
46 based upon the applicable zoning and due to the minimum size requirements restricting other use types of  
47 uses. Moseley added that Simkin would most likely need a variance if he wanted to build a structure  
48 involving a different type of use on the subdivided parcels.

49 Banfield asked why the subdivision was allowed to have parcels on both sides of the road.  
50 Banfield added that if Simkin were to add land that he owns adjacent to the lot, then Simkin would not  
51 need to have an abnormal subdivision configuration.

52 Moseley noted that the adjacent land that Simkin owns is located in the Town of Lansing, which  
53 would not be allowed to be added to a Village parcel unless the land is in the Village of Lansing  
54 jurisdictional area. Moseley added that he and the Planning Board suggested to Simkin to apply for a  
55 variance that, if granted, would allow for a traditional subdivision. Moseley noted that, at a previous  
56 Planning Board meeting, Simkin thought that he might not be granted the area variance and did not want  
57 to proceed in that manner.

58 Banfield noted that the Village would be setting a precedent if they approved this subdivision.  
59 Banfield also noted that the Town of Lansing has not approved the water line yet and a person would  
60 need to cross a drainage way to get to the property located on the north side of the road.

61 Moseley indicated that he had spoken with both Jeff Overstrom and Charlie Purcell from the  
62 Town of Lansing who indicated that they did not need any help in relation to getting Simkin to finalize  
63 the waterline.

64 Banfield noted that this still would be a precedent-setting subdivision which would have a parcel  
65 owned on both sides of the road and a person would need to cross a drainage ditch to get to some of the  
66 property.

67 Tomei noted that his understanding was that this was a request for a subdivision and had nothing  
68 to do with waterlines or buildings.

69 Moseley indicated that he was unaware of any Village Code that would prohibit a subdivision of  
70 this nature. Moseley added that he searched through the Code and had a discussion with his predecessor,  
71 Ben Curtis, about the topic as well. Moseley added that Simkin would still need to meet all side yard, and  
72 front yard setbacks.

73 Banfield asked if Simkin would need to come back to the Planning board for approvals to build a  
74 structure on the proposed land.

75 Moseley indicated that if the house were in the required setbacks and the lot does not have a  
76 drainage way, as indicated on the Village zoning map, or is not in a combining district Simkin could  
77 presumably build as of right unless he asked for a variance to build outside of the required setbacks.  
78 Moseley indicated that he was not sure what Simkin intended to build on the property.

79 Banfield pointed out to Simkin on the subdivision map where he would be crossing a drainage  
80 way in order to access the property. Banfield, with Simkin, approached the Board to explain what he was  
81 concerned about.

82 Simkin noted that if he could add a piece of property from his land located in the Town to the  
83 land in the Village, he would then make the remaining parcel in the Town a non-buildable lot due to  
84 deficient lot area. Simkin noted that the Town building lot size for a piece of property with municipal  
85 water is 30,000 square feet.

86 Dubow noted that the Planning Board could direct the applicant to the Board of Zoning Appeals  
87 for a requested variance. If the variance were to be granted, then that would allow for a smaller lot on the  
88 north side of the road and a larger lot on the south side of the road.

89 Lechner asked if the Village has examined the soil for when Simkin decides to build.

90 Dubow noted that he is not applying for a building permit, but rather a subdivision. Dubow added  
91 that Simkin would be required to abide by all applicable Village Codes and New York State Building  
92 Codes. Dubow noted that Moseley would be the person to discuss those requirements with. Dubow  
93 added that the Planning Board is allowed to take up to 62 days to make a final decision, unless the  
94 applicant and the Village both agree to extend it beyond the 62 days.

95 Kanter asked if the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) could issue an interpretation as to whether or  
96 not this proposed subdivision configuration would be acceptable.

97 Dubow noted that typically a property owner has the right to ask for an interpretation from the  
98 BZA.

99 Tomei noted that the Board would be taking the full 62-day period to make a decision and  
100 recommends that the applicant request a variance from the BZA.

101 Stycos asked if the BZA granted the variance and allowed the applicant to have a parcel on each  
102 side of the road, would that allow for a larger structure on the larger piece of property.

103 Moseley noted that theoretically a larger structure would be able to be built on the southern parcel  
104 of land because the setbacks would be the same as the smaller parcel of land, which would allow for a  
105 larger footprint.

106 Dankert suggested that the applicant proceed to the BZA.

107 Simkin noted that his preference would be to have a lot on both sides of the road, instead of the  
108 current proposed configuration. Simkin noted that if the BZA granted the variance for his request it might  
109 set a precedent. Simkin indicated that he could try to obtain a variance.

110 Banfield supported the idea of the BZA variance based on Simkin owning contiguous land around  
111 the land located in the Village.

112 Moseley asked if Banfield would support the variance by attending the BZA meeting even though  
113 he does not live in the Village, as Banfield is still a neighbor.

114 Banfield indicated that he would support the variance.

115 Dubow noted that he or Moseley would inform the BZA of the recent history and conversations at  
116 the Planning Board meetings so the BZA can make an informed decision on the variance. Dubow added  
117 that ultimately there will very likely be a minor subdivision approval granted that would only allow for a  
118 structure to be built on buildable parcels of land with the applicable setbacks.

119 Stycos stated that she feels it is a worse precedent to allow the north side of the road to be a  
120 buildable lot with a smaller square footage instead of how it is being proposed to the Planning Board  
121 currently (with the northern parcel having a small piece of property attached on the other piece of land to  
122 make the combined lot a minimum of 60,000 square feet).

123 Kanter noted if the BZA were to look at this specific scenario and grant the variance it would not  
124 be precedent setting due to the BZA having to answer specific questions in order to grant the area  
125 variance.

126 Kanter moved to adjourn the public hearing until the August 13<sup>th</sup> meeting, allowing the applicant  
127 to submit an application for an area variance through the BZA. Seconded by Schleelein; Ayes by Tomei,  
128 Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein, and Kanter.

129 **Public Hearing to Consider:**

130 Tomei opened the public hearing for

131  
132 Special Permit No. 2667, Carol Chaplin and Scott Steelman to construct a circular driveway and  
133 second curb cut for the house at 20 Esty Drive located in the Low Density Residential District, Tax  
134 Parcel No. 43.1-1-6. A Special Permit is required pursuant to Sections 145-20 A (1) and 145-48  
135 C(1) of the Village of Lansing Code

136 Tomei explained the code sections that were provided in the legal notice. Tomei asked if there  
137 was any other way the applicants could achieve their intended goal without having a second curb cut.

138 Chaplin noted that due to the angle of their current driveway, it would be unsafe to try and turn  
139 south on Esty Drive.

140 Tomei stated that John Courtney commented on the request and noted that Esty Drive is a narrow  
141 road and does not have a lot of traffic during a typical day. Tomei added that the Tompkins County  
142 Planning Department (required 239 –l and –m review) has also reviewed the request and provided the  
143 Village a letter indicating that there will be no inter-community or county-wide impact.

144 Moseley indicated that he did not receive any official comments from the Village Engineer.  
145 Moseley added that he did contact the Village Engineer who indicated that he had looked at the plan  
146 which was submitted, and stated that he did not have any issues with the extension of the 24-inch road  
147 culvert under the newly proposed driveway. Moseley reminded the Board that they always have the right  
148 to add a condition that the applicant would need to receive formal approval from the Village of Lansing  
149 Engineer prior to commencing work on the driveway and curb cut, if approved by the Planning Board.

150 Tomei noted that he would add the condition that Moseley suggested if the Board approved the  
151 Special Permit.

152 Steelman noted that the potential approval for the second curb cut would be a win for both the  
153 Village and themselves, due to the driveway making it possible for people not to park on the side of the  
154 road.

155 Dankert agreed with Steelman's statement due to the width of the road.

156 Kanter asked if the Department of Public Works is required to approve of these types of permits.

157 Moseley indicated that it is required, and currently the applicants have requested a Temporary  
158 Certificate of compliance due to the DPW not signing off on their current driveway.

159 Dubow noted that SEQRA (State Environmental Quality Review Act) is not required because a  
160 single family home is exempt from SEQRA, but the Village is still obligated to make sure that the  
161 potential environmental issues are dealt with subject to conditions attached to the special permit for the  
162 applicant.

163 Tomei asked for a motion to close the public hearing. Moved by Stycos. Seconded by Dankert,  
164 Ayes by: Tomei, Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein, and Kanter.

165  
166 Tomei read the required special permit general conditions as follows:

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

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

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

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

- 175                   (5) *Natural surface water drainageways are not adversely affected.*
- 176                   (6) *Water and sewerage or waste disposal facilities are adequate.*
- 177                   (7) *The general environmental quality of the proposal, in terms of site planning,*  
178                   *architectural design and landscaping, is compatible with the character of the*  
179                   *neighborhood.*
- 180                   (8) *Lot area, access, parking and loading facilities are sufficient for the proposed use.*
- 181                   (9) *The requested use or facility conforms in all other respects to the applicable*  
182                   *regulations of the district in which it is located.*
- 183                   (10) *The applicant has shown that steps will be taken where necessary to meet all*  
184                   *performance standards and all other applicable general regulations.*

185                   Tomei asked for a motion that all general conditions have been met subject to any conditions that  
186                   the Board may impose on the applicant. Moved by Kanter. Seconded by Stycos; Ayes by: Tomei,  
187                   Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein, and Kanter.

188

189                   The Board members discussed what conditions should be attached to any approval of the special  
190                   permit and Tomei read the following proposed special permit resolution:  
191

192

193                   *VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SPECIAL PERMIT APPROVAL*  
194                   *ADOPTED ON JULY 9, 2012*

195

196

197                   *Motion made by: \_\_\_\_\_ Lisa Schleelein \_\_\_\_\_*

198

199                   *Motion seconded by: \_\_\_\_\_ Maria Stycos \_\_\_\_\_*

200

201                   **WHEREAS:**

- 202
- 203                   A. *This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Special Permit No.*  
204                   *2667, Carol Chaplin and Scott Steelman to construct a circular driveway and second curb*  
205                   *cut for the house at 20 Esty Drive located in the Low Density Residential District, Tax Parcel*

206 *No. 43.1-1-6. A Special Permit is required pursuant to Sections 145-20 A (1) and 145-48*  
207 *C(1) of the Village of Lansing Code; and*  
208

209 *B. The Village of Lansing Planning Board, in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State*  
210 *Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"),*  
211 *and 6 NYCRR Section 617.5, hereby determines that the approval of the proposed special*  
212 *permit is a Type II action, and thus may be processed without further regard to SEQR; and*  
213

214 *C. The Village Code Enforcement/Zoning Officer has determined that the proposed action is not*  
215 *large-scale and therefore is not subject to a full and extensive environmental review under*  
216 *the Village of Lansing Zoning Law; and*  
217

218 *D. On July 9, 2012, the Village of Lansing Planning Board held a public hearing regarding this*  
219 *proposed action, and thereafter thoroughly reviewed and analyzed (i) the materials and*  
220 *information presented by and on behalf of the applicant in support of this proposed action,*  
221 *including information and materials related to the environmental issues, if any, which the*  
222 *Board deemed necessary or appropriate for its review, (ii) all other information and*  
223 *materials rightfully before the Board (including, if applicable, comments and*  
224 *recommendations, if any, provided by the Tompkins County Department of Planning in*  
225 *accordance with General Municipal Law Sections 239-l and -m), and (iii) all issues raised*  
226 *during the public hearing and/or otherwise raised in the course of the Board's deliberations;*  
227 *and*  
228

229 *E. On July 9, 2012, in accordance with Section 725-b of the Village Law of the State of New*  
230 *York and Sections 145-59, 145-60, 145-60.1 and 145-61 of the Village of Lansing Code, the*  
231 *Village of Lansing Planning Board, in the course of its further deliberations, reviewed and*  
232 *took into consideration (i) the general conditions required for all special permits (Village of*  
233 *Lansing Code Section 145-59E), (ii) any applicable conditions required for certain special*  
234 *permit uses (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-60), (iii) any applicable conditions*  
235 *required for uses within a Combining District (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-61), and*  
236 *(iv) any environmental issues deemed necessary and/or appropriate;*  
237

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

239

240

241 *1. The Village of Lansing Planning Board hereby (i) determines that the environmental*  
242 *information and materials submitted by the applicant and the details thereof are reasonably*  
243 *related to the scope of the proposed project; (ii) waives the necessity for any additional*  
244 *environmental information otherwise required; and (iii) finds that the proposed project will*  
245 *not have a significant adverse impact on the environment; and*

246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279

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

3. *It is hereby determined by the Village of Lansing Planning Board that Special Permit No. 2667 is **GRANTED AND APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions and requirements:*

- a. Soil and Erosion control measures shall be implemented and coordinated with the Village of Lansing Code Enforcement Officer (with participation from the Village of Lansing Engineer), and subsequently approved by the Village of Lansing Code Enforcement Officer.*
- b. Coordination with the Village of Lansing Engineer shall be required to obtain final approval for any soil and erosion design, the size of the culvert for the drive way, and any other applicable concerns.*

*The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:*

*AYES: Mario Tomei, Lisa Schleelein, Phil Dankert, Maria Stycos, and Jon Kanter*

*NAYS: None*

*The motion was declared to be carried.*

Kanter asked if a two family dwelling could be allowed on this particular lot. Kanter added that he believes that the intent of the current owner would be to keep it as a single family dwelling. Kanter noted that if a two family dwelling was allowed, parking could be an issue.



280 Moseley noted that a two family home without septic would need a minimum lot size of 90,000  
281 square feet. Moseley added that by his rough calculations, the lot is approximately 32,000 square feet,  
282 which would not even allow for a single family home to be built on the site. Moseley added that the only  
283 reason that they were allowed to build on the existing site is because there was a single family dwelling  
284 on the site, which allows for another structure to be built if desired with reduced setbacks.

285 Kanter felt that parking would not be an issue since the lot would not be able to be transitioned  
286 into a two family dwelling due to the lot constraints.

287

288 **Continued Discussion of the Commercial Low Traffic District (CLT) Uses**

289 Tomei noted that Moseley handed out copies of the draft Planning Board meeting minutes that  
290 dealt with the CLT discussion. Tomei added that based on the last conversation at the Planning Board, it  
291 seemed that a hospital would not be a desired use in the CLT District.

292 Schleelein noted that a shorter height might be better for a transition zone, but after a short  
293 discussion, and after Dubow pointed out that all other zones, except for the Business and Technology  
294 District, are allowed a maximum height of 35 feet, Schleelein noted that it would not be practical to  
295 require one zone to reduce the maximum height.

296 Moseley noted that he has looked into his comment about the location of a three story building  
297 and the proximity to the lot line. Moseley added that typically the New York State Building Code looks at  
298 the fire resistance of the buildings with proximity to other buildings, which may be close to the lot lines.  
299 Moseley added that with the correct materials, a building could be built without a stepped appearance.

300 Tomei noted that Kanter made a comment about the Comprehensive Plan and a Village center.  
301 Tomei noted that possibly the best location for a Village center, according to the Comprehensive Plan, is  
302 on north side of the road on the corner of Triphammer Road and Oakcrest Road.

303 Stycos asked what a "Village center" would be.

304 Kanter noted that it is defined in the CLT District Design Guidelines, which suggests pedestrian  
305 connectivity or walking paths, recreational sites, a gazebo, and a public safety community building.  
306 Kanter added that the design guidelines also discuss trying to mold Triphammer Road into a more village  
307 feel.

308 Tomei asked if the CLT District split would then hinder the Village center idea.

309 Schleelein indicated that she felt it would not. Schleelein added that there is a different feel to the  
310 Village when you get north of Oakcrest Road.

311 Kanter indicated that if the Village were to continue and try to achieve the Village center in the  
312 same location, it would act as a transition point and act somewhat as a buffer between the two zones.

313 Stycos asked how the new office building would fit into the Village center idea.

314 Tomei noted that he thought that the new office building would fit in very nicely to the idea of a  
315 Village center.

316 Upon further discussion the Planning Board decided to separate hospital and clinic uses.

317 Moseley noted that the Convenient Care facility, at 10 Arrowwood Drive, is a clinic and does not  
318 have consistent ambulance traffic, but would have some ambulance traffic associated with its use.

319 Dubow noted that religious facilities are not allowed to be discriminated against, which would not  
320 allow for the Village to remove them from certain zones.

321 Moseley asked if the Planning Board would like to split the CLT District.

322 Upon further discussion, all members that were present suggested to split the CLT District to  
323 achieve a transition zone which would be on the northern side of Oakcrest road, and a slightly more  
324 intense zone on the southern side of Oakcrest Road.

325 Kanter suggested that the Village look at why they wanted to split the CLT district and what the  
326 purpose is for doing so. Kanter added that he believes that the distinct fact of splitting the CLT District  
327 may more effectively address the Triphammer Road corridor where there might be smaller lots  
328 redeveloped that might resemble what the CLT District Design Guidelines explain. Kanter noted that the  
329 Village should keep in mind what these zones would look like in 20 to 30 years.

330 Schleelein noted that if the CIAO! Restaurant was not on the corner of Oakcrest and Triphammer  
331 Road, that intersection would have a different atmosphere.

332 Tomei noted that there was talk about small scale retail moving into the Triphammer Road  
333 corridor. Tomei added that it might be difficult for a developer, with the price of land, to develop a small  
334 scale retail store on a very expensive piece of land.

335 Kanter indicated that is why it would be incorporated with a mixed use development. Kanter  
336 noted that “mixed use” is a use that currently is allowed in the CLT District, but retail of any nature is not  
337 allowed. Kanter suggested that the Village would need to define small scale retail.

338 Moseley presented a preliminary definition of small scale retail: Small Scale Sales Retail—All  
339 Retail of soft and hard goods with a maximum size of 10,000 ft<sup>2</sup> per story; jewelry; clothing; pet store;  
340 pharmacy; book store; Laundromat; bar or tavern. (Encouraged to be incorporated with Mixed Use and  
341 provide for a pedestrian oriented shopping experience).

342 Moseley added that small scale might not always mean a “mom and pop” store on the corner, but  
343 it could mean a chain store developing a new prototype. Moseley inquired whether a drive-in or drive-  
344 thru would be applicable to a drug store.

345 Kanter noted that if the Village is trying to create a more pedestrian-friendly area, a drive-in or  
346 drive-thru would not be a good idea. Kanter suggested codifying some of the CLT District Design  
347 Guidelines. Kanter suggested that the description of mixed use might need to be fairly specific if the  
348 Village intends to achieve a certain appearance.

349 Stycos asked if residential apartments over the top of some commercial uses are desirable, and  
350 how practical that might be.

351 Schleelein indicated that she feels that people would like to live over a commercial use.

352 Kanter noted that incentives might be a good idea to encourage mixed use development.

353 Moseley added that the CLT District Design Guidelines were instituted prior to the Triphammer  
354 Road reconstruction project, which incorporated a lot of greenery for the Village and pedestrian  
355 connections as well. This is not to say that the Village could not have more pedestrian connections or  
356 green spaces. Moseley added that there has been development that has incorporated pedestrian  
357 connections and green areas, such as gardens in the Village. Moseley noted that the Village continues to  
358 work on enhancing their pedestrian connectivity.

359 Kanter added that he liked the language that Moseley has started to provide so far.

360 Moseley noted that his understanding is that he would, for the CLT Zone:

- 361 1. Divide into two zones- CLT-1 and CLT-2
- 362 2. Define clinic
- 363 3. Remove construction sales and storage
- 364 4. Remove hospital from transition zone

365 Dubow suggested that the Planning Board inform the Trustees about the progress of what has  
366 been discussed about these potential new zones as ultimately the Board of Trustees will determine  
367 whatever Zoning Law amendments might be appropriate.

368 Tomei and Moseley noted that they could discuss this at the upcoming Trustee meeting on  
369 Thursday.

370 Baker noted that currently, the Trustees are looking, globally, at the Comprehensive Plan. Baker  
371 suggested a joint meeting might be in order to discuss the topic.

372 Dubow suggested public information meetings might be helpful before the required public  
373 hearings to get some feedback.

374 Tomei asked if any of the members would like to incorporate a hotel use in either of the zones.

375 Schleelein noted that she did not due to the size of a hotel structure.

376 Kanter noted that it should be looked at to make sure that it would or would not fit into either of  
377 the zones.

378 Schleelein noted that an inn would be nice.

379 Tomei noted that any building can be demolished and a use, like a hotel, could be built on the  
380 existing site.

381 Kanter suggested that it may be possible, but all of the members should think about which zone it  
382 should be located in if it decided to be incorporated in the CLT District areas.

383 Tomei noted that he would not like to see a hotel on Craft Road.

384 Schleelein noted that the applicants did make a good case to locate a hotel next to CIAO!.

385 Stycos asked if the museum/public building use should be allowed in the transition zone.

386 Tomei asked about indoor recreation/club or outdoor recreation/club use.

387           Upon further discussion it was decided to allow for both the indoor and outdoor recreation/club  
388 use to be in the transition zone due to the uses being subject to a Special Permit.

389           Schleelein noted that they might allow the Group Residential use, but would need to re-define the  
390 use and possibly not allow for fraternity, sorority, etc.

391           Stycos noted that a group residential use, such as a halfway house, should still be allowed for  
392 people that need assistance.

393           Tomei suggested waiting on the group residential and the museum/ public building uses for the  
394 next conversation on this topic.

395

396

397    **Approval of Minutes**

398           None

399    **Reports**

400           None

401

402    **Other Business**

403           Moseley provided to the Board members language to possibly incorporate into the Village Code  
404 for an extension of an existing special permit for a Temporary Commercial Activity. Moseley asked the  
405 Board members to read through the draft language that he had prepared and to which Dubow made some  
406 revisions, and provide any comments and/or proposed changes at the next meetings.

407    **Adjournment**

408           Stycos moved to adjourn at 9:53PM. Seconded by Schleelein; Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Stycos,  
409 Schleelein, and Kanter.