

Village of Lansing
Planning Board Meeting
April 10, 2000

The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 pm by Chairman Hickey. Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Brown, Halevy, Klepack and Waterman, alternate member Dankert, Village Attorney Marcus, Code Enforcement Officer Curtis and Trustee Liaison Leopold.

Public Comment:

Evan Meltzer wanted to discuss the issue of 24 Cedar Lane as it relates to the intent of the home occupation law. For someone to take an existing viable business from a commercial area and move it into a residential area is probably not the intent of the law. His sense is that the law is to provide for somebody who just wants to do a little business in their home and not disrupting a residential area by doing so. He feels that there's been more traffic on the road as a result of this business. It's subjective and it's obviously their word against somebody else's word. They don't have a way of actually measuring traffic but he just knows it is more hazardous now than it was when he first moved onto Cedar Lane. There are more cars coming down the road that don't know the road and it's a little scary for a pedestrian.

The Chairman interrupted these comments because the Sutton home occupation item is an item on the agenda. Meltzer wanted to go on record saying he is opposed to the extension of the time limit. It just adds another three months to their troubles on Cedar Lane.

A motion to close the Public Comments moved by Waterman, seconded by Halevy. All in favor.

Sutton Home Occupation - Extension of Time Limit:

An April 7 letter from Peter J. Walsh, the lawyer for Sutton, requests a three month extension of time to resolve the issue of the deficient side yard set-back. He indicates that they have formally asked the Hartshornes to give Sutton a deed for the small strip of property which is at issue to bring the Sutton's property into conformance with the set-back requirement.

Hickey received a letter from Mr. Hartshorne stating that he will not grant any additional conveyance of property. Now the only course of action available requires Mr. Sutton to apply to the BZA for a variance. The three months extension provides the time to process this application. The application has not been made yet.

Hickey clarified the situation stating that it is necessary to clear up this violation of the set-back requirement before considering the home occupation special permit. The issue before the Board is to vote on whether or not they are going to extend the time limit. Waterman moved to extend the time limit for three months until the Board's first meeting in July, on a one time only basis. At the end of three months, Sutton can pursue whatever legal recourse necessary to gain compliance. When he is in compliance, he can apply for the special permit again. It will be noted that the Planning Board may not look favorably upon any further extensions of time. It puts Sutton on notice that there are definite time constraints but it also frees the Board if there are sufficient reasons to grant another extension.

Waterman moved to accept that motion. Seconded by Halevy. All in favor. Curtis will send Sutton a letter informing him of the extension and the conditions.

-
Kensington Road Design - Discussion:

Hickey would like to place the Kensington issue in the Green Space Plan category as it relates to the establishment of walkways that connect high density developments to the commercial area. It is a Green Space project that would connect the Northwood apartments to the Graham Road sidewalk so that people can walk to the Malls. This would be a five foot wide blacktop trail from the beginning of the Northwood property all the way down to and over the sewer easement at Churchill. Swartout and Ferris agreed to build a bridge over the creek. Hickey will take this issue to the Mayor to discuss funding of this project with road maintenance funds or the Green Space Plan budget. There should be money to do it under the Green Space Plan.

The discussion expanded to the issue of sidewalks and safe access to the major commercial areas from places such as Kendal, Savannah Park and the Cornell Business and Industrial Park. The high traffic area where the bridge spans over Route 13 is particularly difficult for pedestrians due to the noise of traffic under the bridge and getting across the access ramps. Furthermore, the pedestrian crossing lights are not always in the best places or effective. In the winter snow often is cleared onto the sidewalks making pedestrian travel even more difficult.

Hickey would like permission of the Board to discuss the issue of Kensington with the Mayor prior to the next meeting and then to report back to the Board. Waterman made the motion to permit Hickey to do that, Halevy seconded. All in favor.

The Board returned to the issue of the proposed 28' wide street which would be wide enough to encourage higher speed traffic. Costs could be lower with a switch from concrete to blacktop for the walkway. One suggestion would be to put a five foot wide shoulder for a walkway on one side of the road. It should be striped for walking only, not for traffic. In terms of funding for the sidewalks, there should be a way to accumulate funds.

There is a road maintenance plan that shows which roads are going to be rebuilt which year but it doesn't include walkways. The next step is to review the Dart Road Study to estimate the costs of that sidewalk and then translate it to this project. It could be submitted for ISTEAF funding and see what happens. The funding cycle may mean that gets approved for five years from now in the next round of funding.

The Board needs to ask Audrey Edelman to redo her subdivision and submit it to the Board. She probably will not do this until they know the that the sewer problem has been resolved.

Commercial Low Traffic Study Update:

The Planning Board will meet with EDR on April 12 to review the status of the contract. On March 28, 2000, Environmental Design & Research requested that their letter act as the basis of the agreement for the Commercial Low Traffic Design Project. On April 6, 2000, the Planning Board responded with a letter which included various modifications to correct errors therein and to more accurately state the terms that should be agreed upon between the Village and EDR. The product of the April 12 meeting should be the final draft of the contract. The goals and objectives and the time line from the final draft of the contract should be sent to the Focus Group for the third meeting. However the information concerning the compensation of EDR should be omitted.

The Board proceeded to review EDR's letter:

Task 1 Data Collection, Base Map Development and Focus Group Meeting.

There have been two meetings of Focus Groups. The second meeting occurred over sixty days ago. A proposed date

for the third Focus Group Meeting should be set on April 12. The results of the meeting on Wednesday will be presented for the third meeting of the Focus Group. The public needs something that is closer to a final product to react to.

In reviewing the letter of April 6, it was agreed that the third bullet "Attend focus group workshop (initial focus group meeting has been conducted; additional meeting yet to be scheduled)" should be under Task 3. With that change accomplished, Task 1 is complete.

Task 2 Site Analysis and Concept Development, is complete.

Task 3 Development of Preliminary Design Guidelines will include the Task 1, third bullet. To clarify Task 3, bullet 2, "Develop preliminary CLT design guidelines" it should state "and deliver to the Planning Board for distribution to the Focus Group." Thus, there is clearly a step before it is presented to the Focus Group.

Task 4 Further Development of Design Guidelines. Add to the third bullet, "Deliver written report to the Planning Board..." and review the report at a joint meeting of the Planning Board and the Board of Trustees.

Task 5 Development and Presentation of Final Report of Design Guidelines Add language to bullet 2 to require that the report also be provided in electronic format and stipulating that the Village owns the final product.

Marcus suggested that unless there were additional changes to the third page, he will make the changes on the first and second page and fax it with his signature on the third page to the Board tomorrow. Referrals to compensation should be eliminated. The focus of the letter is the progress on the project.

Klepack offered to draft a cover letter to go with the minutes stating that this is the schedule of tasks and that this is an interim progress report. In the cover letter it can state that the minutes were edited to pertain only to items directly relating to the project.

The Planning Board's attention turned to EDR compensation. The contract was for \$15,000, there are no approved additions. Specifically, EDR has clearly spent time on items that were beyond the description of the work that the Planning Board asked them to do and the Second Focus Group meeting included a lot of material that ignored the constraints specifically stipulated by the Planning Board – that the permitted uses in the District would not change and that the North Triphammer Road Reconstruction Project would be built as exactly as planned. This may cause EDR to find that they have less time than they had originally planned to accomplish the project which the Village hired them to do.

At the Wednesday meeting the Board and EDR can discuss the budget of \$15,000. The Board can state how it would like the project structured. In turn, EDR may say that they can't do all this for \$15,000. The current proposal does not show how EDR will use the \$15,000. on an itemized basis. If EDR says it can't complete the project with this funding, the Planning Board must ask them prioritize what there is that they can do. Then the Board will decide whether that is acceptable or not. This provides a negotiating position for the Board. If there's something really substantial to be completed and they refuse to do or say they can't do then that must be discussed. The Board's bottom

line is \$15,000 and EDR has known that from day one. The lost time from both Focus Group meetings and preliminary design work is their responsibility.

Some members of the Board felt the EDR contract lacked definition and contained more jargon than was necessary. Hickey suggested EDR should provide the Board with a design for the empty properties in the CLT and how these can be connected to each other. It should indicate how this relates to the connectivity and traffic circulation of the area given the existence of the reconstructed North Triphammer Road. They haven't yet focused down to the nitty gritty of what their special zones, A,B & C are and how they relate to the Planning Board's goals. Marcus will fax the revised contract to them with a cover note saying that this is for review at the Wednesday meeting.

Reports:

Trustee Meeting: Klepack reported that it was directed to the budget. She will bring her notes to the next Planning Board meeting.

Approval of the Minutes:

Lansing Planning Board meeting for February 29. Hickey complimented the Board for the marvelous job with the Greenspace Advisory Committee.

Line 23 is GAC and not GAS.

Page 2, Line 6, "The Board decided to try placing two trash cans as a pilot program." They were intended for the Cayuga Mall and Triphammer Mall.

Page 2, Line 7. It should read Soil Conservation Service seedling; the Board felt....

Page 2, Line 15. "Waterman suggested that Warren Road is more in need of striping than Janivar and that will be suggested to Reinhart." Halevy reported that he discussed this with Mr. Reinhart. He said that Reinhart already has an item in his budget to stripe Warren Road.

Waterman made the motion to accept the minutes as amended, seconded by Halevy. All in favor except Hickey who abstained because he was not there.

Other Business:

Curtis recommended that Connie Kindig, transcriptionist, should be recognized for her work for the Board. Discussion centered on the appropriate certificate that could be prepared. Curtis will explore the details of this recognition. The new transcriptionist for the Board is Ann Marcham.

Hickey opened discussion on how Planning Board members attended other Village meetings. Were they satisfied with the current arrangements? Should there be changes in the assignments? The members will consider this for a future meeting.

Leopold reported that the Mayor received two inquiries in the past week on use of the Village water tower as a communication tower. The water tower is located near the airport. The Mayor was approached by Sprint and Bell

Atlantic. It is possible that the water tower could be razed and a communications tower erected in its place. Another location suggested for the communication tower was in the area of the Public Safety buildings. Any tower that is constructed should be available for other companies as required in the Village's law.

-

Adjourn:

Motion to adjourn by Waterman, seconded by Klepack. All in favor.