

Village of Lansing
Planning Board Meeting

July 10, 2000

The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 P.M. by Chairman Hickey. Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Brown, Halevy, Klepack and Waterman; Code Enforcement Officer Curtis; Engineer Cross; Attorney Marcus; and members of the public.

Public Comment:

There was no one present who wished speak. Waterman moved to close the Public Comment period, seconded by Halevy. All in favor.

Sutton Home Occupation:

The first agenda item was a continued discussion of the Sutton Special Permit for a Home Occupation. Prior to the meeting, Sutton provided the Board with a chronological list of what has occurred up to this point in time. Hickey asked for a report on what has happened up to today in terms of a purchase offer. Sutton responded that Hartshorne's attorney is on vacation so they have not received anything yet and they have not filed a suit as they are awaiting a purchase price. Hickey stated the Board has extended the time periods for this home occupation permit and may again extend it until the end of July when the Suttons should know (a) if they will buy it if they have a purchase price or (b) if they will file a law suit, and forward a copy of relevant documents to this Board. Waterman questioned how long the home occupation should be allowed to continue while the property is out of zoning compliance. Hickey stated Curtis enforces the Code and the Suttons must be in compliance before the Planning Board can approve the Special Permit for the Home Occupation. Curtis stated the Suttons can purchase the property, return to the BZA for a variance, or Curtis can send an order to demolish the addition. Waterman stated if this is a lengthy process, she feels the Home Occupation should not be allowed to continue without a permit but she is willing to wait until the end of July.

Halevy moved to extend the time limit application for the Home Occupation Permit for Sutton until July 25, 2000. Seconded by Brown. Marcus stated that it is important to get Sutton's concurrence with this time limit extension. Sutton stated he is in agreement. Klepack said Sutton will appear at the next meeting and the Board would expect to hear what action has been taken. All aye.

Special Permit #1540 – Cornell Fingerlakes Credit Union:

The next item on the agenda was the Special permit #1540, Cornell Fingerlakes Credit Union to construct a 3500 SF bank branch building with drive-thru at 15 Sheraton Drive, the northwest corner of Sheraton Drive and Cinema Drive, in the Commercial High Traffic District, Tax Parcel No. 46.1-6-4.2

Robert Witty (CFCU representative), Peter Bodycombe(Cayuga Landscape) and John Lavrich (HB Architect) were present to give the presentation. They began by showing the site plan. The building is designed to look exactly like the East Hill branch. The site plan shows an entrance on Sheraton Drive for park and enter business with 36 parking spaces of which 13 parking spots are for employees. The Cinema Drive approach would be for the 4 drive-up windows and drive-up ATM with extended and night hours. Two curb cuts will assist with traffic flow. A lighted freestanding sign of 9 SF is proposed on the corner.

Hickey opened the Public Hearing and no one requested to speak. Waterman moved to close the Public hearing. Seconded by Halevy. All aye.

Hickey questioned whether the 4 drive-thru lanes would be sufficient to allow for stacking so there would not be a traffic problem on the road similar to that caused by McDonalds. Witty stated that at the Meadow St. branch, the

stacking distance is less than the distance proposed here and there they can accommodate 4 cars plus the car at the station. There has never been a stacking problem at that site and there will be an additional teller at this site. The turn-over time per customer is approx. 7-10 min. Hickey felt the distance is short and might back onto the road and could block the Cinema Drive entranceway. Lavrich stated that the CFCU is making a conversion to newer system on Dec. 1 to speed up the process.

Hickey asked how the people would get from the A & P to this site. Hickey did not feel they would use the sidewalk on Sheraton Dr. but would walk behind the Sheraton to the bank. CFCU feels customers would use the current sidewalk. The Board recommended the existing sidewalk be extended to the edge of the property.

Halevy stated a Lighting Plan (including fixture cut sheets) for all exterior lighting must be submitted, reviewed by the Lighting Commission and approved by the Planning Board. Cross recommended there be a justification as to why special lighting for the ATM is required. Witty said this is a state mandated requirement for ATMs.

Klepack asked about signage. Lavrich responded they are limited to one free-standing 9 SF sign for the corner but they might like to request an additional 30 SF on the south elevation over the entrance canopy. Hickey questioned why the free-standing sign would be on the corner and why not move it to the driveway on Cinema Drive.

Curtis asked about parking over-flow possibilities and what determines if it is adequate. Lavrich responded that there are 13 parking spots for employees and based on past experiences for buildings this size, approx. 23 dedicated customer parking spots will be adequate for this size building. Witty responded that on Meadow St. there are only 7-9 parking spots for customers. Curtis was concerned whether the apartment dwellers would find their lot being used for over flow.

Hickey asked for the hours of operation. Witty responded M-F 9-5, with drive-up to 6:30 but 7:30 on Th. Also Saturday hours would be 9-1, with drive-up to 3. The walk-up ATM would remain in the Triphammer Mall so this may help with overflow if customers see there is a long line at the proposed CFCU.

Marcus went back to the issue of stacking at the drive-thru. He recommended a stacking diagram showing cars and statistics from other branches should be given to this Board similar to the information requested from McDonalds. Hickey asked for peak hour number of cars anticipated to use the drive-thru based on Meadow St. and Triphammer Mall statistics. Using that data for number of transactions, the Board could better determine if the proposed facility will be able to manage the projected traffic without problems with traffic on Sheraton and Cinema Drive or overflow parking on neighboring properties.

Halevy asked how customers would be kept from parking in employee parking spaces. Witty said the employees usually get there early and stay. Signage could be considered but most members would choose to park at the closer spots rather than those that may be vacated by the employees during the lunch hour.

Klepack said this will increase the amount of traffic at the corner of Cinema Dr. and the Triphammer Mall and the Village should be aware of this. Hickey also noted that this would increase the traffic at Sheraton Dr. and N. Triphammer Road.

Hickey asked about sidewalks and Lavrich responded that the sidewalks at driveways will be modified for handicapped.

The Planning Board had copies of the Engineer's Report. Cross briefly reviewed his memo as these will be conditions for approval of the permit. (1) The plans indicate stormwater detention basin that appears to be able to handle the run-off from the new impervious surfaces area, but no calculations have been provided to demonstrate the sizing of the facilities. There also appears to be openings in the curbing to allow run-off to flow off from the pavement, but no detail(s) have been provided. (2) The driveways and parking lot configuration appears to be sufficient to handle the ingress/egress of traffic as well as maneuvering space, but no dimensions have been provided so that this can be verified. Lavrich responded that dimensions are 9'x20' parking spaces with 24' aisles and 36' driveways (3) Although not indicated as such, there appears to be a dumpster enclosure on the west side of the building. No details have been provided. Lavrich responded that there is a screen wall for an enclosure for garbage cans. (4) No site lighting

information has been provided. Since banking institutions require extra intensity lighting for security purposes, Cross suggests that a submittal to the Lighting Commission indicate the specific information for the specialized lighting. (5) All of the utilities are shown on the plan, but no engineering details have been provided for review. Cross noted that a sewer unit has been purchased and they have been in to apply for it.

Bodycombe reviewed the landscaping plan showing different deer resistant vegetation. The south side also includes trees that act as a buffer with the residential area. Hickey asked about the existing spruce trees and whether they would screen the lights of the ATM from the hotel rooms. Consideration needs to be given to that property also. The landscaping plan may need to be revisited after the lighting plan is submitted.

Hickey noted that a 150' buffer strip is needed when a Commercial High Traffic District abuts a high-density residential area and the buffer strip must be totally within the commercial district (Zoning Law 104.21). This district boundary would be from the center of the road. The center of Cinema Dr. to the edge of the building would be 130', to the edge of the parking would be 100', and to the edge of the driveway would be a little under 60'. One possibility might be to seek a variance. Another possibility might be to use the adjoining lot which is also owned by Thaler but would abut another commercial district. Cross noted that adjacent municipalities may need to be notified. Curtis responded that this has been sent to the County Planning Dept. for a 239 and that they had determined that there would be no detrimental impact. Hickey stated that no action could be taken tonight as the issue of the buffer must be resolved and it will be tabled until then. Waterman moved to table the Special Permit pending receipt of additional information and a resolution of the buffer requirement, seconded by Klepack. All in favor.

Marcus stated the architect should be given an explanation as to how the buffer requirements apply to this site and how to proceed to the BZA for a variance. Curtis will contact BZA members to see if there is a possibility of their meeting in August.

Special Permit #1544, Robert and Maxine Dean:

The next agenda item was Special permit 1543, Robert and Maxine Dean to construct a 100 SF addition on their home at 42 Esty Drive in the Low Density Residential District, Tax Parcel No. 43.1-1-1. A Special Permit is required pursuant to Section 202.12 of the Village of Lansing Zoning Law because construction will occur within 200' of the centerline of a stream included in the Conservation Combining District.

Planning Board members had received a map of the contours and the location of the house and the proposed construction. Hickey opened the Public Hearing and no one from the public spoke. Waterman moved to close the Public Hearing. Seconded by Brown. All aye.

The Planning Board reviewed the Engineer's Report. Due to the design, there is very little excavation and there will be almost no disturbance of the sensitive area

Hickey reviewed the General Conditions for Special Permit (Section 304.05) to ascertain it met the requirements a-j. Waterman moved the applicant has met the general conditions required for Special Permits for this action. Seconded by Brown. All aye.

Waterman moved to approve Special Permit #1543, Dean residence addition, where the applicant has met the applicable general conditions required for all Special Permits under Section 304.05. Seconded by Halevy. All aye.

-

Special Permit #1544, Greene Residence:

The next agenda item was for Special Permit #1544, Bruce and Maria Greene to construct a 9100SF residence at 9 Pembroke Lane in the Low Density Residential District, Tax Parcel Nos. 48.1-2-2.3 & 2.4 (reputedly one lot). A Special Permit is required pursuant to Section 202.12 of the Village of Lansing Zoning Law because construction will

occur on a lot which contains slopes 15% or greater and may fall within a Unique Natural Area and is therefore included in a Conservation Combining District.

Marcus noted for the record that he has on various occasions represented Dr. Greene. The Board had no problem with Marcus participating.

Curtis stated tax maps show this as two parcels. Tax assessor states he has no record of lots being combined. Curtis remembers an amendment to the subdivision plan where the lot line was moved, the road shortened and lots combined. McLain could not find the receipt but had the note from his attorney indicating the date it was recorded by the County Clerk. As a condition, evidence will need to be provided indicating that these lots were combined.

Hickey opened the Public Hearing and no one from the public spoke. Waterman moved to close the Public Hearing. Seconded by Klepack. All aye.

The Engineer's Report was reviewed. The drainage and run-off for this site were previously accounted for when the developer's plans for subdivision were reviewed and there is no additional run-off proposed. There appears to be a modification to the adjacent outlet control structure proposed, but having spoken to the architect prior to the meeting Cross had determined that it is not for drainage but rather for aesthetic purposes. Silt fence is indicated on the plan and should be sufficient to handle erosion control although it would be beneficial to have additional fencing and bales if needed in case of a storm. Cross stated the Health Dept. has approved a septic system. Henry Cesari, architect for the project, stated the engineer is Frank Santenelli from TG Millers. He will provide a hydraulic analysis for the detention structure.

Hickey questioned the amount of grading to be done. Greene showed a diagram showing where excavation would occur being minimal due to the shale level. There would be a half basement due to the slope. There would be a moderate amount of grading to level the site.

Greene stated the fewest number of trees possible would be removed. There would be approx. 15-20 trees over 8 inches that would have to be removed. TG Millers checked the site for trees 16 inches and over and there would be none over that size removed. Cesari stated that landscape plan had not been prepared yet, but Hickey noted it will be required as a condition for final approval. Plants should be deer resistant and also stabilize soil from erosion. Hickey noted that when the SEQR was completed for the subdivision, the botanist's report for the Cayuga Hills Subdivision had proven helpful.

Greene asked about splitting the lot again into two parcels. Curtis stated it is not possible to now go back to two separate parcels as there would not be the required road frontage on the second property because of the road being shortened 100 ft. Marcus stated that legally it is one lot and only the Assessment Dept. feels it is two lots. He further stated that the Planning Board, in approving that lot, looked at the overall environmental improvement to that area resulting from eliminating one lot.

Cross asked for the diameter of the driveway culvert. Greene responded that it is not noted. Curtis stated the culvert would be subject to the approval of Reinhart for both design and size.

Roof drainage will be routed into the dry well system, as well as the runoff from the driveway.

Hickey reviewed the General Conditions for Special Permit (Section 304.05) to ascertain it met the requirements a-j. Waterman moved the applicant has met the general conditions required for Special Permits. Seconded by Klepack. All aye. Klepack asked about the dedication of the road. Hickey noted that it has not yet been dedicated. That will probably occur after the construction is done. Marcus thought the road had been dedicated but the Village is holding a security for the top coarse of pavement. Curtis noted the road is a separate tax parcel. Marcus will check on the status of this road.

Marcus noted that this is an exempt action under SEQR 617.5C9 construction of a single-family residence on an approved lot.

Hickey noted the following Special Permit conditions: 1) Final approval by Village Engineer for drainage and erosion controls 2) Final approval by the Superintendent of Public Works for the culvert pipe under the driveway 3) Approval of Landscaping Plan by Planning Board and implementation of that plan before Certificate of Occupancy is issued and 4) evidence that the two lots have been combined into one satisfactory to the Board of Assessment.

Waterman moved to approve Special Permit #1544, Greene residence subject to conditions 1-4, where the applicant has met the applicable general conditions required for all Special Permits under Section 304.05. Seconded by Klepack. All aye.

Road Maintenance:

Cross discussed the roads in the Village where final paving of the roads would be more advantageous to be done at a later date after major construction has occurred. In some developments this may be years later. Marcus responded that this is why the Subdivision Law is written as it currently exists as circumstances vary greatly. If roads are accepted without the final coating for any length of time, who would be held accountable. If the base course holds up, it is to the Village's financial benefit but if it fails, it is to the builder's benefit. Hickey stated Reinhart could also recommend changing the road specs if he so desired.

CLT Guidelines:

Hickey spoke with Sieverding who spoke with Manning. Manning is phasing himself out of Trowbridge & Wolf to pursue some work on his own. Sieverding explained to him what the Village is proposing to do. Hickey is awaiting a response from Manning as to whether he is interested. Klepack would like for Wolf to be considered also. After Hickey hears from Manning, he will contact Klepack who can then contact Wolf.

The Board reviewed the goals and objectives proposal by Klepack. Waterman and Brown stated it looks good. Halevy referenced page 3 where it indicates what is currently allowed in Zoning Law. It also speaks of mixed use which was eliminated from the Zoning Law as a permitted use. This can be further discussed with the next consultant. Curtis felt it should be emphasized that the N. Triphammer Rd. reconstruction is designed and the guidelines must be compatible with it. Brown stated she was not pleased with designating architectural styles and prefers the variety. It is the design elements, ie., setbacks, heights, landscaping, etc. which should be consistent rather than the architectural style.

Unique Natural Areas:

Board members received copies of the new Unique Natural Areas in the Village as part of their consideration of the Greene residence. Hickey noted it should be added to the Unique Natural Areas binder and should also become a part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Minutes:

Curtis reported that Willard will be working from the tapes to transcribe minutes for the Planning Board. Klepack moved to accept the minutes of June 27, 2000 as revised. Seconded by Waterman. All aye.

Town of Lansing:

Hickey noted that he will be having lunch this week with Brad Griffin, Town of Lansing Planning Board Chairman. The Board was pleased to see the outreach from the Town.

Engineer's Report:

In response to a request that the Engineers reports be distributed in the packets so Board can review them prior to the meeting, Cross reminded the Board that he receives his packet on Friday and he feels that if the Planing Board can review his reports at the meeting, it avoids delaying the application until the following meeting.

Adjournment:

Waterman moved to adjourn at 9:57 P.M. Seconded by Brown. All aye.