**Village of Lansing**

**Planning Board Meeting**

**May 13, 2013**

The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 P.M. by Chairman Mario Tomei.

Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Maria Stycos, Phil Dankert, Lisa Schleelein; Alternate Member Deborah Dawson; Code Enforcement Officer Marty Moseley; Village; Trustee Liaison Lynn Leopold; Frances and Crystal Mullinex; and Kevin Alford from GMY Associates.

Tomei appointed Dawson as an acting member for the meeting due to the absence of Planning Board member Jon Kanter.

# Public Comment Period

Tomei opened the public comment period.

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

**Requested changes to the Previously Approved Cayuga Mall Planting Plan**

Alford indicated that he was present on behalf of the owners of the Cayuga Mall. Alford had submitted a letter of request to the Board which requested a change from the original proposed trees on the west side of the True Value outside storage area due to a misplacement of the erected fence. Alford added that the fence was laid out and due to inclement weather; the fence was placed too close to the west side property line thus not allowing for the previously approved plantings to be installed. Alford noted that the second request would be to eliminate the planter on the north side of the outside storage area due to negative impact of salt on the proposed plantings. Alford noted that the grade of the parking lot drains towards the north side plantings which could have a negative impact. Alford proposed to install a patterned fabric that would cover the fencing and screen the outside storage area on both the north and west sides. Alford added that the fabric would allow for wind to move through it.

Moseley indicated that he and John Courtney (Superintendent of Public Works) were on site when the fence was being laid out. Moseley added that it seemed that the fencing was not intentionally placed to eliminate the plantings, and the fence was actually moved further south to accommodate snowplowing for the Village. Moseley added that the owner thought that the fence was placed in the correct area to accommodate for the plantings on the west side, but there was a misunderstanding where the lot line was due to snow covering the appropriate layout marks.

Dankert asked if a raised lined planter could be used in association with the north side plantings to protect them from the salt and runoff.

Alford indicated that they could install a raised lined planter.

Schleelein noted that she wanted to see the plantings because of all the other improvements to the mall. Schleelein supported the idea of the raised lined planter.

Tomei suggested installing a curb or installing the raised lined planter on the north side. Tomei added that the fabric could be used on the west side to soften the visual impact. Tomei noted that there were existing plantings on the west, on the bank property, that also aided to soften the visual impact of the fence

Stycos suggested planting the trees on the west side inside of the fence, and allow for them to grow through the fence.

Tomei noted that if the trees were planted on the inside it would remove some of the storage area from the fenced in area.

Schleelein noted that the Friendly’s dumpsters were an eyesore.

Alford indicated that the planting plan did not screen the Friendly’s dumpsters but rather the outside storage area for True Value.

Dawson supported the raised lined planter on the north side and the fabric on the west side.

Tomei noted that a revised landscaping plan needs to be submitted to the Planning Board for approval.

Schleelein moved to allow for the following modifications to the existing Cayuga Mall landscaping plan: (i) allowing for a raised planter on the north side of the outside storage area and (ii) allowing for the stone fabric in place of the plantings on the west side of the outside storage area. Dawson seconded; Ayes: Tomei, Stycos, Dankert, Schleelein, and Dawson.

Alford requested to be on the agenda for May 28th.

**Continued Discussion on the CLT (Commercial Low Traffic) Changes.**

Tomei noted that he would like to have most of the CLT changes wrapped up by May 28th to possibly allow for a joint meeting with the Trustees in June.

Leopold noted that either June 3rd or June 10th would probably work the best.

The Board reviewed the potential changes that they previously discussed at the April 8th Planning Board meeting.

Tomei noted that the multi-unit residential use would be placed in the “permitted with special permit” category.

Moseley explained that the group residential facility (grf) and group residential building (grb) are different items. Moseley added that the grf would be a use such as a nursing home or assisted living. Moseley noted that the grb would include uses such as dormitory, fraternity, or club.

Tomei noted that he would like to see the grb eliminated from both CLT districts and not just the transitional zone.

Dankert suggested allowing for the grf to be allowed in both districts.

Schleelein noted that she failed to see the difference between the grb and the grf.

Moseley indicated that at previous meetings the Planning Board indicated that they wanted to split the fraternities from the assisted nursing facilities due to traffic differences, night life differences, etc.

Schleelein questioned why the reasons were not listed in the explanations.

Moseley indicated that the Village Code does not typically explain why the uses are split from one another or why different uses are incorporated in different sections, but rather what uses are allowed in each district or how uses are typically explained. Moseley added that the minutes reflect how the Board arrived at the final conclusion to create the CLT-1 and CLT-2 with the new applicable uses and explanations.

Schleelein noted that she would like the zoning to be clear and not require someone to research the minutes to clearly understand the Village Zoning.

Moseley added that he proposed the new terminology, which could be modified if needed, and which would need to be incorporated in the Zoning Law if approved.

Tomei asked about the indoor/outdoor recreation club.

Moseley noted that the YMCA would be an indoor recreation club. Moseley added that the Tompkins County game/gun club is located off of East Shore Drive in a low density residential district.

Stycos noted that they could have a grandfathering clause.

Moseley indicated that he found it hard to believe that anyone could actually install an outdoor game/gun club in one of the proposed CLT districts on the basis of the amount of area that would be required for one.

Tomei noted that the outdoor recreation club is not just a shooting range, but it could also be a swim club or tennis courts.

Tomei noted that government buildings should be allowed in both districts, as well as museums and public buildings.

Tomei noted that the undertaking use should be removed from both districts because of the potential traffic impact on Triphammer Road during a funeral procession. Tomei added that undertaking is allowed in the high density residential district.

Schleelein note that a religious facility also has a lot of traffic affiliated with their events at some points in time which may not be too different from an undertaking use.

Tomei noted that a religious facility usually has many parking spaces associated with that use, but the undertaking use usually does not have the amount of parking needed during the event.

Dankert agreed that undertaking could create traffic congestion along the Triphammer corridor.

Leopold noted that due to the unpredictability of the undertaking events it would be hard to plan for the impact of traffic.

Tomei suggested removing the hospital use from both the CLT-1 and CLT-2.

Leopold noted that if a hospital were to locate in the Village, it would make the most sense to locate in the existing human health services district.

Tomei noted that the construction sales and storage use would be located in CLT-1 corridor district but not the CLT-2 transitional district.

Moseley noted that a construction sales storage use would not be a typical Home Depot or Lowes.

Tomei noted that the low traffic food and beverage use would only be allowed in the corridor district and the low impact technology use would remain in both districts.

Tomei noted that the bed and breakfast use would be added in both districts.

Leopold noted that there is no hotel or motel use in either district.

Tomei noted that the newly proposed small scale sales use would be needed to be coupled with the mixed use term.

Moseley asked if the Board intended the small scale sales to be only coupled with residential uses or if they would allow for the small scale sales to be considered mixed if it was retail and office space.

After a short discussion the Board indicated that they only wanted the small scale sales to be used if a residential use was to be mixed with it as a “mixed use” defined by the Village Code.

Stycos asked about drive-thru’s.

Moseley noted that a drive-thru depends on the main use of the tenant or building. Moseley added that a fast food business would use a drive-thru as part of the main business, but a pharmacy would probably have more of an accessory drive-thru that would only be used part of the time.

Tomei agreed with Moseley

Dawson asked about the difference between a bar/tavern and a low traffic food and beverage use.

Moseley indicated that a low traffic food and beverage would be a sit down restaurant that could have a bar in it, but a bar or tavern would be specifically just a bar or tavern and would not typically have a delineated area for food consumption like a restaurant.

Tomei asked if the small scale sales should be incorporated into the CLT-1 corridor district.

Dawson indicated that she feels CLT-1 should include the use, but she was not sure if the use would be able to be built and sustain itself.

Stycos noted that she did not like the idea of allowing a laundromat as a use.

Moseley noted that if a residential use was in the top of the building and the laundromat use was on the ground floor, it would allow for the residents of the building to use the laundromat and not add to traffic on Triphammer Road.

Schleelein noted that the small scale sales would not be allowed in the CLT-2 transitional zone.

Tomei noted that the bank administrative use would be allowed in both of the CLT districts.

Tomei noted that a residential building on a single lot would stay in both districts as well.

Moseley indicated that there are additional conditions for a residential building on a single lot, which is in section145-58 of the Village Code.

Stycos asked why section 145-58 came into existence.

Moseley noted that, to his knowledge, it was created because an individual wanted to build an additional home on a single lot for their aging father, but the zoning did not allow for that specifically. The individual then attached the structure, by way of an enclosed walkway, which then provided the structure to be built because it was then considered an addition.

Stycos noted that the additional residential building would not need to be specifically an “in-law house”.

Moseley noted that the current design guidelines for the CLT zone require a new building to be placed closer to North Triphammer road, which would theoretically provide for a parking lot behind the building. Moseley asked if this design guideline would still be applicable to the new transitional zone.

After a short discussion the Board determined that they would keep the design standards that would require buildings to be built closer to Triphammer Road.

Mullinex noted that she would love to have people walk in front of her business and have TCAT bus service farther north on Triphammer Road.

Moseley asked if a group residential facility could be allowed in a more residential setting.

Dawson suggested that the Board not look at other districts due to possible complications.

Tomei noted that the Board could wrap up this matter at the next meeting and possibly make a recommendation to the Trustees after that.

**Approval of Minutes**

None

**Reports**

Dankert reported on the Trustees minutes of May 6th. Please see the minutes of that meeting for a report.

**Other Business**

Leopold asked for all Planning Board members to look over the proposed comprehensive plan survey questions and comment back to her or Julie Baker.

**Adjournment**

Schleelein moved to adjourn at 9:30 PM. Seconded by Dankert**;** Ayes: Tomei, Stycos, Schleelein, Dankert, and Dawson.