

**Village of Lansing  
Planning Board Meeting  
August 13, 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 Richard Durst, Lisa Schleelein, and Phil  
4 Dankert; Code Enforcement Officer, Marty Moseley; Village Attorney, David Dubow; Trustee Liaison,  
5 Lynn Leopold; James Knittel from Dalpos Architects; Haig Buchakjian from Brixmor Properties; Boris  
6 Simkin representing Westview Partners; Roy Hogben; and Community Party observer Robert Schleelein.

7

8 **Public Comment Period**

9 Tomei opened the public comment period.

10 Robert Schleelein noted that he was the Community Party observer.

11 With no further comments from the public, Durst moved to close the public comment period.  
12 Seconded by Schleelein; Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Schleelein, and Durst.

13

14

15 **Continuation of Public Hearing for:**

16

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

21 Dubow indicated that based upon the Planning Board's suggestion, Simkin applied for an area  
22 variance, through the BZA (Board of Zoning Appeals), which would allow for Simkin to have a 42,360  
23 square foot lot, on the north side of Sun Path Road, to be designated a buildable lot for a single family  
24 residence and allow for the remainder of the property, on the south side of the road, to be the other  
25 buildable lot. Dubow added that Simkin was granted the variance. Dubow added that these parcels are  
26 still considered one parcel, but upon the potential approval of the subdivision by the Planning Board, they  
27 would then be split into two parcels. Dubow noted that the Zoning Law setbacks are still applicable to  
28 both lots.

29 Leopold asked if there was originally a building on Simkin's property.

30 Moseley indicated that there was, but it was torn down in approximately 2005.

31 With no one else wishing to speak, Dankert moved to close the public hearing. Seconded by  
32 Durst; Ayes by Tomei, Dankert, Schleelein, and Durst.

33 Tomei read the following proposed resolution:



82 case the proposed minor subdivision would be held in abeyance and the public hearing would  
83 be adjourned to the regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting on August 13, 2012; and  
84

85 G. On July 9, 2012, the applicant indicated that it would follow the recommendation of the  
86 Village of Lansing Planning Board and would make application to the Village of Lansing  
87 Board of Zoning Appeals for an area variance for what would be a subdivided lot on the  
88 north side of Sun Path Road encompassing less than the 60,000 square feet required in the  
89 Low Density Residential District; and  
90

91 H. On July 9, 2012, based upon the foregoing, the Village of Lansing Planning Board  
92 adjourned the public hearing to August 13, 2102 pending the area variance determination to  
93 be made by the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals; and  
94

95 I. On August 1, 2012, the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals, after holding a public  
96 hearing as required, and after reviewing the proposed area variance application and  
97 supporting documents, granted such variance and thereby approved the creation of what  
98 would be a newly subdivided lot encompassing 42,603 square feet on the north side of Sun  
99 Path Road as part of the proposed minor subdivision; and  
100

101 J. In August 13, 2912, the Village of Lansing Planning Board acknowledged receipt of a revised  
102 minor subdivision plat provided by the applicant reflecting the modified division of the  
103 property and the creation of (i) the one subdivided lot on the north side of Sun Path Road  
104 encompassing 42,603 square feet as authorized by the area variance granted by the Village  
105 of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals, and (ii) the second subdivided lot comprising the  
106 remainder of the proposed minor subdivision on the south side of Sun Path Road  
107 encompassing 84,477 square feet; and  
108

109 K. On August 13, 2012, the Village of Lansing Planning Board continued the public hearing  
110 regarding this proposed action, as revised as indicated above, and thereafter completed its  
111 review and analysis of (i) the proposed final subdivision plat and accompanying materials  
112 and information presented by and on behalf of the applicant in support of this proposed  
113 action, including information and materials related to environmental issues, if any, which the  
114 Board deemed necessary or appropriate for its review; (ii) all other information and  
115 materials rightfully before the Board; and (iii) all issues raised during the public hearing  
116 and/or otherwise raised in the course of the Board's deliberations;  
117  
118

119 **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:**  
120  
121

122 1. Based upon all of its foregoing review and action, it is hereby determined by the Village of  
123 Lansing Planning Board that approval of the final proposed Westview Partners, LLC Minor  
124 Subdivision is **GRANTED**, subject to the conditions and requirements set forth below;  
125  
126

127  
128 2 The Chairperson of the Village of Lansing Planning Board is hereby authorized and directed  
129 to sign the final plat for the approved minor subdivision in accordance with subsection F of  
130 Section 125-6 and subsection A of Section 125-15 of the Village of Lansing Code.

131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139

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

*AYES: Mario Tomei, Lisa Schleelein, Phil Dankert, and Richard Durst*

*NAYS: None*

*The motion was declared to be carried.*

140

141 **Continuation of Public Hearing for:**

142 **Special Permit No. 2676**, Brixmor Properties to (i) construct an outside fenced-in storage area and (ii)  
143 construct a new façade for the existing property located at 2309 North Triphammer Road, the Cayuga Mall,  
144 located in the Commercial High Traffic District, Tax Parcel Number 46.1-5-4.2. Special Permit review is  
145 required pursuant to section 145-43D(1)[j] and section 145-59.  
146

147 Knittel indicated that he has worked with both Moseley and Cross within the past two weeks to  
148 come to this point. Knittel added that they have changed the position of the outside storage area to  
149 accommodate traffic patterns, vehicle parking, loading facility, and pedestrian traffic. Knittel added that  
150 they have added some striped areas to help control vehicle traffic flow. Knittel added that there is a  
151 possibility that they would also add further striping for the site. Knittel indicated that the sales associate  
152 and cash register which would serve the outside storage area would have a 4' x 6' moveable shed. Knittel  
153 indicated that they would need to make provisions to provide electricity and water to the outside area.  
154 Knittel added that they would provide a new landscaping plan, because he feels what is represented on the  
155 current proposal is too much.

156 Tomei noted that a landscaping plan to be approved by the Board could be a condition to any  
157 special permit approval granted.

158 Knittel indicated that JoAnn Fabrics will have a new entrance piece, while TrueValue, Rite Aid,  
159 and Party City will have their entrances under the canopy. Knittel added that they felt a wider sidewalk  
160 would be in order from JoAnn Fabrics to TrueValue. Kittel noted that they would like to have a total  
161 sidewalk width of 10 feet with a minimum 24 foot drive lane. Knittel noted that they aligned the various  
162 façade heights.

163 Tomei noted that Knittel extended the TrueValue and Rite Aid façade heights to match the Party  
164 City and JoAnn Fabrics arches instead of decreasing the height on the arches as requested by the Planning  
165 Board.

166 Knittel indicated that the requested height decrease in the arches did not look very proportional,  
167 so he took some artistic initiative. Knittel added that the new proposed height is 30 feet.

168 Tomei indicated that he did not like the appearance of the TrueValue façade due to the top  
169 appearing like a false front.

170 Tomei asked for them to be lowered.

171 Buchakjian noted that the arches cannot be lowered too much because the bottom of the arch  
172 would then run into the building, which is not very appealing. Buchakjian felt that raising the other flat-  
173 topped façades to the height of the arch façades deals with the comment from the previous meeting.  
174 Buchakjian suggested to have the flat-topped façades of the tenants mimic the Rite Aid façade (meaning  
175 that they would have returns to make them appear more substantial).

176 Tomei agreed that would make the appearance of the façades more appealing.

177 Schleelein noted that she liked neutral colors on the façades. Schleelein asked if Party City could  
178 provide a different schematic which did not use such a variation in color.

179 Buchakjian noted that the façade that has been proposed is always used by Party City nationwide.

180 Leopold noted that the TrueValue façade was red and that was not really a neutral color.

181 Schleelein asked if the new façade would be extended to the corner of the mall.

182 Buchakjian indicated that they would only be working on these currently proposed façades at this  
183 time.

184 Tomei noted that the outside storage area needs to be moved back 10 feet from the edge of the  
185 pavement to the plantings, fencing, etc. so the Village snowplow would not damage any of the Cayuga  
186 Mall property.

187 Knittel indicated that they could reduce the number of plantings in that area from what is  
188 currently proposed in order for that to happen. Knittel added that they would still plant the bushes and  
189 blue spruces, but it would just be a slightly reduced number.

190 Tomei asked if parking lot crosswalks will be striped for the Rite Aid and the Party City  
191 entrances areas (JoAnn Fabrics and TrueValue are proposed to have crosswalks).

192 Schleelein asked about stop signs.

193 Knittel noted that they would not be removing the stop signs at the main intersection.

194 Buchakjian asked to continue to have an open dialogue with Brent Cross to finalize certain items  
195 such as stops signs, crosswalks, line striping, etc...

196 Tomei asked if there was new exterior lighting being installed.

197 Buchakjian noted that the intent is to replace existing lighting under the canopy and to only light  
198 the sidewalk.

199 Knittel indicated that JoAnn Fabrics will have to address some way to light the sidewalk.

200 Dankert noted that a lighting plan will be required.

201 Tomei read the following Engineer's report:

**VILLAGE OF LANSING**  
**ENGINEER'S REPORT**

202  
203  
204  
205  
206 *DATE: August 13, 2012*

207  
208 *TO: Planning Board*

209  
210 *FROM: Brent Cross, Village Engineer*

211  
212 *RE: Outdoor Sales & Façade Improvements, Cayuga Mall*

213  
214 *I have reviewed the Site Plans as prepared by Dalpos Architects, dated 8/7/12, for a Special Permit*  
215 *approval. I have the following comments and observations:*

216  
217 1. *To help guide vehicles and pedestrians, I recommend that the double yellow "center" line be*  
218 *continued from the back enter/exit driveway around/across the front of the new outdoor sales*  
219 *area.*

220  
221 2. *As a result of "bumping out" the sidewalk in front of the proposed new Jo-ann and True Value*  
222 *stores, there are several vehicle/pedestrian related issues that need attention for pedestrian*  
223 *safety:*

224  
225 *-since the sidewalk is not protected from the traffic by a curb, I recommend that bollards be*  
226 *installed along the edge to create a barrier, both physical and visual, to keep the cars off the*  
227 *sidewalk.*

228  
229 *-since the driving lanes will be shifted/realigned, I recommend that a double yellow center line be*  
230 *added to the roadway between the sidewalk and parking lot.*

231  
232 *-the intersection at the entrance driveway and parking lots has always had a stop sign in the exit*  
233 *direction. I recommend that it be retained and enhanced with stop bars and turning arrows*  
234 *painted on the pavement.*

235  
236 *-since there is likely to be pedestrian traffic from the main parking lot to the outdoor sales area, I*  
237 *recommend that new crosswalk be painted on the pavement at the stop sign for the "north-south"*  
238 *parking area between Friendly's and Jo-ann.*

239  
240 *-since there are designated crosswalks at the Jo-ann and True Value entrances, should there be*  
241 *crosswalks at other locations, specifically at Rite Aid and Party City?*

242  
243 *-the previous P&C entrance had an elongated crosswalk with a stop sign at each end. The new*  
244 *Jo-ann and True Value have smaller individual crosswalks. Should there be a stop sign in each*  
245 *direction, or should there not be any stop signs. As proposed it seems to be halfway in between.*

246  
247 *-if the "landscape islands" (actually raised planter boxes) are to be moved to accommodate the*  
248 *dimensions of the new sidewalk "bump out", will they be replaced? As an observation, there is a*  
249 *fire hydrant located in one of them.*

250  
251 Buchakjian indicated that they would replace the raised planters.  
252 Knittel added that they may only need to skinny the planters up and not fully remove them.  
253 With no comments from the public, Tomei asked for a motion to close the public hearing. Moved  
254 by Schleelein. Seconded by Durst; Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Schleelein, and Durst  
255 Tomei read what was filled in by the applicant on Part I of the SEQR Short Environmental  
256 Assessment Form (EAF).  
257 Part II of the Short EAF was answered as follows by the Planning Board: A: no; B: no; C1 –C7:  
258 none; D: no; and E:.no.  
259  
260 Tomei read the following SEQRA resolution with the attached conditions, if any, from the Board.

261  
262 **VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SEQR REVIEW OF SPECIAL**  
263 **PERMIT NO. 2676 ADOPTED ON AUGUST 13, 2012**

264  
265 *Motion made by:* \_\_\_\_\_ Phil Dankert \_\_\_\_\_

266  
267 *Motion seconded by:* \_\_\_\_\_ Lisa Schleelein \_\_\_\_\_

268  
269 **WHEREAS:**

- 270  
271 A. *This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Special Permit No.*  
272 *2676, Brixmor Properties to (i) construct an outside fenced in storage area and (ii) construct*  
273 *a new façade for the existing property located at 2309 North Triphammer Road, the Cayuga*  
274 *Mall, located in the Commercial High Traffic District, Tax Parcel Number 46.1-5-4.2.*  
275 *Special Permit review is required pursuant to section 145-43D(1)[j] and section 145-59; and*  
276  
277 B. *The proposed action provided for herein is an Unlisted Action in accordance with SEQR for*  
278 *which the Village of Lansing Planning Board is an involved agency for the purposes of*  
279 *environmental review; and*  
280  
281 C. *On August 13, 2012, the Village of Lansing Planning Board, in performing the lead agency*  
282 *function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance with*  
283 *Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental*  
284 *Quality Review Act (“SEQR”), (i) thoroughly reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment*  
285 *Form (the “Short EAF”), Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted*  
286 *with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review, (ii) thoroughly analyzed*  
287 *the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action*  
288 *may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in*  
289 *6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), and (iii) completed the Short EAF, Part II;*  
290

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

292  
293

294 1. *The Village of Lansing Planning Board, based upon (i) its thorough review of the Short EAF,*  
295 *Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed*  
296 *action and its environmental review, (ii) its thorough review of the potential relevant areas of*  
297 *environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse*  
298 *impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c),*  
299 *and (iii) its completion of the Short EAF, Part II, including the findings noted thereon (which*  
300 *findings are incorporated herein as if set forth at length), hereby makes a negative*  
301 *determination of environmental significance (“**NEGATIVE DECLARATION**”) in*  
302 *accordance with SEQR for the above referenced proposed action, and determines that an*  
303 *Environmental Impact Statement will not be required; and*

304

305 2. *The Responsible Officer of the Village of Lansing Planning Board is hereby authorized and*  
306 *directed to complete and sign as required the Short EAF, Part III, confirming the foregoing*  
307 ***NEGATIVE DECLARATION***, *which fully completed and signed Short EAF shall be*  
308 *attached to and made a part of this Resolution.*

309

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

311

312 *AYES: Mario Tomei, Lisa Schleelein, Richard Durst, and Phil Dankert*

313

314 *NAYS: None*

315

316 *The motion was declared to be carried.*

317

318 Tomei read the required special permit general conditions as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

337 Tomei asked for a motion that all general conditions have been met subject to any conditions that  
338 the Board may impose on the applicant as part of any approval granted. Moved by Durst Seconded by  
339 Dankert; Ayes by: Tomei, Dankert, Schleelein, and Durst.

340 The Board members discussed what conditions should be attached to any approval of the special  
341 permit and Tomei read the following proposed special permit resolution:  
342

343 **VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 2676**  
344 **ADOPTED ON AUGUST 13, 2012**

345  
346  
347 Motion made by: Lisa Schleelein

348  
349 Motion seconded by: Richard Durst

350  
351 **WHEREAS:**

- 352  
353 A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Special Permit No.  
354 2676, Brixmor Properties to (i) construct an outside fenced in storage area and (ii) construct  
355 a new façade for the existing property located at 2309 North Triphammer Road, the Cayuga  
356 Mall, located in the Commercial High Traffic District, Tax Parcel Number 46.1-5-4.2.  
357 Special Permit review is required pursuant to section 145-43D(1)[j] and section 145-59; and  
358  
359 B. On July 31, 2012, the Village of Lansing Planning Board determined that the proposed  
360 action is an Unlisted Action for which the Board is an involved agency, and in performing the  
361 lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in  
362 accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State  
363 Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"), the Board commenced its environmental  
364 review of the proposed action; and  
365  
366 C. On July 31, 2012, the Village of Lansing Planning Board opened a public hearing regarding  
367 this proposed action, and thereafter commenced its review and analysis of (i) the materials  
368 and information presented by and on behalf of the applicant in support of this proposed  
369 action, including information and materials related to the environmental issues, if any, which  
370 the Board deemed necessary or appropriate for its review, (ii) all other information and  
371 materials rightfully before the Board (including, if applicable, comments and  
372 recommendations, if any, provided by the Tompkins County Department of Planning in  
373 accordance with General Municipal Law Sections 239-l and -m and comments provided by

- 374 *the Village Engineer), and (iii) all issues raised during the public hearing and/or otherwise*  
375 *raised in the course of the Board's deliberations; and*  
376
- 377 D. *On July 31, 2012, the Village of Lansing Planning Board determined that it would be*  
378 *appropriate, useful and necessary, prior to taking further action, for the applicant to provide*  
379 *further information and materials with respect to certain environmental matters and special*  
380 *permit matters related to the proposed action, and therefore completion of the SEQR review*  
381 *was deferred and the public hearing was adjourned to the next regularly scheduled Village of*  
382 *Lansing Planning Board meeting on August 13, 2012; and*  
383
- 384 E. *On August 13, 2012, the Village of Lansing Planning Board acknowledged its receipt of*  
385 *additional information and materials regarding the proposed action and its environmental*  
386 *and special permit review, and thereupon proceeded with the SEQR review and the*  
387 *continuation of the adjourned public hearing; and*  
388
- 389 F. *On August 13, 2012, the Village of Lansing Planning Board, in further performing the lead*  
390 *agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance*  
391 *with SEQR, the Board (i) thoroughly reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment Form*  
392 *(the "Short EAF"), Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with*  
393 *respect to this proposed action and its environmental review (including the additional*  
394 *information and materials identified and requested at its meeting on July 31, 2012, and all*  
395 *other supplemental information and materials provided to the Board), (ii) thoroughly*  
396 *analyzed the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed*  
397 *action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria*  
398 *identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), (iii) completed the Short EAF, Part II; and (iv) made*  
399 *a negative determination of environmental significance ("Negative Declaration") in*  
400 *accordance with SEQR for the above referenced proposed action and determined that an*  
401 *Environmental Impact Statement would not be required; and*  
402
- 403 G. *On August 13, 2012, the Village of Lansing Planning Board completed and closed the*  
404 *adjourned public hearing regarding this proposed action, and thereafter thoroughly reviewed*  
405 *and analyzed (i) the materials and information presented by and on behalf of the applicant in*  
406 *support of this proposed action, including information and materials related to the*  
407 *environmental issues, if any, which the Board deemed necessary or appropriate for its review*  
408 *(and including the additional information and materials identified and requested at its*  
409 *meeting on July 31, 2012, and all other supplemental information and materials provided to*  
410 *the Board), (ii) all other information and materials rightfully before the Board (including, if*  
411 *applicable, comments and recommendations, if any, provided by the Tompkins County*  
412 *Department of Planning in accordance with General Municipal Law Sections 239-l and -m)*  
413 *and the Village Engineer, and (iii) all issues raised during the public hearing and/or*  
414 *otherwise raised in the course of the Board's deliberations; and*  
415
- 416 H. *On August 13, 2012, in accordance with Section 725-b of the Village Law of the State of New*  
417 *York and Sections 145-59, 145-60, 145-60.1 and 145-61 of the Village of Lansing Code, the*  
418 *Village of Lansing Planning Board, in the course of its further deliberations, reviewed and*  
419 *took into consideration (i) the general conditions required for all special permits (Village of*  
420 *Lansing Code Section 145-59E), (ii) any applicable conditions required for certain special*  
421 *permit uses (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-60), and (iii) any applicable conditions*  
422 *required for uses within a Combining District (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-61);*

423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471

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

1. *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*
  
2. *It is hereby determined by the Village of Lansing Planning Board that Special Permit No. 2676 is **GRANTED AND APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions and requirements:*
  - a. *Any such items associated with the outside sales and storage area shall be located 10 feet from the edge of the property line (fencing, plantings, etc.).*
  - b. *Any exterior lighting that will be installed shall be submitted to and require approved from the Village of Lansing Lighting Commission prior to the installation.*
  - c. *A landscaping plan shall be submitted to and require approval from the Village of Lansing Planning Board prior to the installation of any plantings.*
  - d. *Coordination with the Village of Lansing Engineer shall be required to obtain final approval for all concerns as indicated on the attached document titled Village of Lansing Engineer's Report for the Outdoor Sales & Façade Improvements and any other applicable concerns.*
  - e. *The owner of the Cayuga Mall property (or designated agent of such owner) shall enter into an Easement agreement in favor of the Village of Lansing for installation, construction, reconstruction, use, operation, maintenance, alteration, repair, removal, replacement or relocation of a sidewalk extension, such easement area to be approximately 10' x 10' situated west of the existing Friendly's Restaurant concrete area and extending westerly to the easterly boundary of the Exxon/Mobil property.*
  - f. *The owner of the Cayuga Mall property (or designated agent of such owner) shall enter into an agreement or other acceptable document(s) in favor of the Village of Lansing providing for the Village to exercise snow plow turnaround access rights on Owner's mall property situated beyond the easterly end of Catherwood Road East (a Village public road).*

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

*AYES: Mario Tomei, Lisa Schleelein, Phil Dankert, and Richard Durst.*

*NAYS: None*

472 *The motion was declared to be carried.*  
473

474 **Cayuga Mall Planned Sign Area (PSA):**

475 Buchakjian noted that the current PSA is an outdated document that created difficulties for the  
476 Cayuga Mall. Buchakjian noted he would like to simplify the document to be similar to what is allowed at  
477 the other shopping centers in the area.

478 Tomei noted that they are proposing some more vibrant colors for signs, where typically the  
479 Village would like to see a softer approach. Tomei noted that the signs that are proposed are not  
480 obtrusive.

481 Buchakjian noted that they are basically requesting what the tenants would like for a main sign  
482 area size, but with some limitations. Buchakjian noted that he also supplied the Board members with the  
483 plan for the proposed front pylon.

484 Leopold indicated that she likes the colors of the pylon. Leopold noted that the Village has  
485 allowed other signs with company colors, like Tops.

486 Tomei noted that he is not opposed to the appearance of variations with respect to the proposed  
487 signs. Tomei noted that in the proposed amended PSA the size of stores with a façade length of 1-23  
488 linear feet would be allotted 30 square feet, the size of stores with a façade length of 24-29 linear feet  
489 would be allotted 40 square feet, the size of stores with a façade length of 50 or more linear feet would be  
490 allotted 50 square feet, and spaces that have more than 14,000 square feet would be allotted a 150 square  
491 feet.

492 Buchakjian indicated that they wanted to change to 14,000 square feet from 15,000 square feet  
493 because Party City exceeds 14,000 square feet, which would allow them to have a larger sign. Buchakjian  
494 added that Party City wanted even a larger sign but in recognition of asking for something new he felt it  
495 would be better to only ask for 150 square feet.

496 Moseley asked if there would be more than one sign associated with a single tenant because, if  
497 that was going to be allowed by the Village, the PSA document would need to reflect those specifics.

498 Buchakjian noted that if and when the amended PSA is agreed upon by both the Village and  
499 Brixmor, it would be the responsibility of the individual tenants to obtain their respective sign permits.  
500 Buchakjian indicated that he would not be involved with the process.

501 Buchakjian noted that he would amend the proposed language to possibly allow up to three signs  
502 per tenant not to exceed 150 square feet.

503 Dubow asked if the new Sumo Japanese's Hibachi restaurant sign, which was previously granted  
504 an amendment to the existing PSA document by the Village, would be in compliance with what is being  
505 discussed this evening.

506 Moseley indicated that the new restaurant was approved to have 45 square feet of signage, and he  
507 therefore suggested to the Board to allow 45 square feet for all other stores that would fall into the 24-49  
508 feet of façade.

509 Tomei agreed to Moseley's suggestion to increase the proposed signage from 40 - 45 square feet  
510 for the store front façade length that would fall in between 24-49 feet.

511 Buchakjian asked if the Econo-Lodge and Pizza Hut should be included in the Cayuga Mall PSA.  
512 Buchakjian added that he was not sure that he was the appropriate party to contact the Econo-Lodge and  
513 Pizza Hut.

514 Moseley indicated that they were part of the original Cayuga Mall PSA which would then make it  
515 the responsibility of the applicant to make sure that all parties agree to the terms and conditions which  
516 have been agreed to with the Village.

517 Dubow noted that it appeared at this time that the applicant is asking for amendments to be made  
518 to the PSA document for the main building (Cayuga Mall) independent of the other PSA participants.

519 Schleelein noted that the person who owns Econo-Lodge did present himself at the last Planning  
520 Board meeting to discuss the PSA with the Cayuga Mall.

521 Buchakjian indicated that he had a discussion with the Econo-Lodge and they expressed interest  
522 in being included in the Cayuga Mall pylon. Buchakjian indicated that is the reason for requesting a large  
523 pylon sign. Buchakjian noted that he would offer Pizza Hut the same option.

524 Moseley suggested that the Planning Board incorporate language in the PSA which would allow  
525 for a sign to be approved administratively up to 50 square feet.

526 Tomei agreed that it would be a good idea to incorporate language similar to what Moseley had  
527 suggested for the larger tenants.

528 Buchakjian thought that Moseley's ideas were a good solution but would suggest removing a 150  
529 square foot cap for the 14,000 square foot tenants.

530 Moseley indicated that the Cayuga Mall would still need to have some type of system for the  
531 amount of overall signage that could be allowed for the entire PSA. Moseley added that there should be  
532 some documentation about the size of the pylon (if approved).

533 Dubow noted that the present stores over 14,000 square feet are currently allowed signs  
534 significantly less than what is being proposed.

535 Buchakjian asked if they could just attach a drawing of the pylon to the PSA document.

536 Moseley indicated that a drawing would be acceptable, but it would need to show all dimensions  
537 of the pylon signage.

538 Buchakjian noted that the size of the pylon is reflective of what is necessary in order for traffic to  
539 observe what is located in the Cayuga Mall. Buchakjian noted that the sizes of the larger signs are  
540 approximately 2 feet by 9 feet.

541 Tomei asked where the new pylon is proposed to be located.

542 Buchakjian noted that it probably would be located in a similar area as the existing pylon, but not  
543 in the exact same location.

544 Schleelein noted that the proposed pylon is sticking out of the ground quite far.

545 Knittel indicated that the pylon would allow for some landscaping, and the pylon allows for better  
546 visibility since Triphammer Road is at a higher elevation than the mall.

547 Durst noted that even if Big Lots and T.J. Maxx came in to apply for 150 square feet if this  
548 proposed amended PSA document were to be approved by the Village, those stores are located at the end  
549 of the mall where they are not as visible as the rest of the mall façade, so the larger sign probably would  
550 not have a significant impact.

551 Dubow asked how large Target's sign is.

552 Moseley thought that the Target sign is approximately 150 square feet of signage.

553 Schleelein asked how big Target is.

554 Moseley indicated that Target is approximately 135,000 square feet.

555 Dubow asked if the drawings for the new proposed tenant spaces represented a 150 square foot  
556 sign in conjunction with the façade.

557 Knittel indicated that it was approximately 150 square feet of signage.

558 Dubow asked if the 150 square feet per tenant was at the tenants' request or by Brixmor's design.

559 Buchakjian noted that the national tenants always ask for more signage than what is allowed.

560 Schleelein noted that she would like to see the façade signs reduced to 135 square feet.

561 Buchakjian asked if they would be able to be granted a sign permit under the new PSA document  
562 if it was not formally approved by the Trustees, but was scheduled to be approved in the future.

563 Dubow noted that a sign permit at this time could only be granted on the basis of the current PSA  
564 documents.

565 Dankert suggested recommending this document, with the discussed changes, to the Trustees.

566 Moseley asked if there were to be any signs with respect to the outside storage area.

567 Buchakjian indicated that he thought they would not have any signs in conjunction with the  
568 outside storage area.

569 Moseley asked about the size, location, and timeline associated with the proposed temporary sign  
570 language.

571 Buchakjian noted they would conform to the Village regulations with respect to the temporary  
572 signs. Buchakjian asked if he could bump the other smaller signs up 5 square feet, which would allow for

573 the size of stores with a façade length of 1-23 linear feet to be allotted 35 square feet, the size of stores  
574 with a façade length of 24-29- linear feet to be allotted 45 square feet, and the size of stores with a façade  
575 length of 55 or more linear feet to be allotted 50 square feet.

576 Tomei indicated that he had no opposition to adding the 5 square feet, and the Board generally  
577 agreed.

578 Durst moved to recommend the proposed PSA document, with all of the discussed changes, to the  
579 Trustees. Seconded by Dankert; Ayes by: Tomei, Dankert, Schleelein, and Durst.

580 **Approval of Minutes**

581 None

582 **Reports**

583 *Schleelein reported on the August 6<sup>th</sup> Trustee meeting. For a report please see the minutes for*  
584 *that meeting.*

585

586 **Other Business**

587 *None*

588 **Adjournment**

589 Durst moved to adjourn at 9:52 PM. Seconded by Dankert; Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Schleelein,  
590 and Durst.

591