

**Village of Lansing
Focus Group Meeting
March 8, 2001**

In Attendance: Steven Halevy, Larry Fresinski, Ben Curtis, Carol Klepack, Janet Waterman, Michael Ward, Phil Dankert, Gertrude Armbruster, John Butler, Carl Edwards, Maria Stycos, and Kathryn Wolf and Annette Marchesseault (Trowbridge & Wolf).

CLT Focus Group Presentation – Kathryn Wolf:

Halevy stated that tonight would be the final meeting of the Planning Board/Focus Group for the CLT District. He then introduced Carol Klepack as the liaison between the Planning Board and the Focus Group.

Klepack thanked those who were in attendance and introduced Kathryn Wolf of Trowbridge and Wolf who had provided members with the draft *Village of Lansing, Commercial Low Traffic District Design Guidelines* prior to the meeting.

Wolf asked for a show of hand of those who had reviewed the draft and many hands were raised. She then suggested the draft be reviewed page by page. At the end of the document are diagrams which she will summarize.

Carl Edwards expressed concerns about the dropped curbs and height of crosswalks with regard to clearances of low cars. Wolf stated two options have been presented and, depending upon grades, each site must be evaluated on a case by case basis.

The cover was reviewed first. Fresinski attempted to get a price to have the underground utilities and stated now would be the time to implement this and an estimated cost given to him was \$100,000 although he feels it would be less.

Page by Page Review:

Acknowledgement Page: Mayor's name and Planning Board members list are incorrect. Corrections will be made and Focus Group member list will be alphabetized.

Table of Contents: No changes.

Introduction: CLT District boundary lines are incorrect. More road names to be included. Map also to be enlarged.

Page 2: Halevy noted that Ned Hickey's suggestion was to add a goal regarding signage. Halevy also noted that for the N. Triphammer Road Reconstruction, Dennis Reinhart stated the recommended design based on NTR Guidelines should be adhered to. Wolf responded that there were some inconsistencies and she will correct them. Wolf noted that Klepack had pointed out that No. 3 on Page 3 is more a goal and it should be moved to the goal section. Halevy and Waterman suggested practical examples of traffic calming should be given. Curtis asked for clarification on the statement that curb cuts are not allowed at access drives. Wolf stated this means that curb cuts would not be allowed to wrap the curb onto N. Triphammer but instead the curb would drop so the sidewalk continues straight across. Wolf suggested including pictures to illustrate this and she sees a need to add other illustrations in the document as well. Wolf stated access drives are a dropped curve but street intersections would have curb returns. The City of Ithaca has implemented dropped sidewalks.

Page 3: Halevy stated that for Item No. 5, Reinhart has stated that high pressure sodium may be costly. Halevy also requested examples of best horticultural practices for Item 7 and Wolf agreed to provide a tree-planting detail. Halevy recommended making *Recommended Street Trees of Ithaca* a part of the document as an appendix.

Page 4: Dankert asked for a definition for wayfinding and Halevy stated it might be useful to include a definition section; others thought the terms could be explained in context. Klepack and Wolf have discussed the rail fencing.

They discussed that in the public right-of-way along N. Triphammer Road, the split rail fence could be placed where the screen planting is shown and the Village install it on the public ROW between the sidewalk and the private property. The shrub planting (Item 8) could be optional and be moved to private property to screen the parking. Gertrude Armbruster, 4 Leifs Way resident, asked for a sample of the split rail fence and Klepack stated it is on both of the west sides of N. Triphammer Rd. near Route 13 and it was originally planned to contribute to a Village identity or logo incorporating existing rural features such as those seen on Sun Downs Farm and it seems natural to continue its use. Wolf reiterated that the Village will install fence within the Village public ROW behind the sidewalk and Item 8 for the ornamental hedge to screen parking will be moved to private property and be the responsibility of the developer. Ward recommended someone look at the split rail fence for scale as it looks great along N. Triphammer Rd. where it is as it is 30-40 ft. from the ROW; it may look tall and bulky closer to the road. Wolf stated that it might be beneficial to look at the placement and it might be helpful to have a bark mulch under it for mowing purposes. It was noted that in some spaces the split rail fence would be right along the sidewalk rather than at the build-to line. Maria Stycos, 28 Twin Glens Rd, resident, questioned why there would be different guidelines for where bushes are planted. She also wanted to know how the split rail fence would fit in the drawings shown on Page 5 as she liked that concept and not the split rail fence idea. Waterman questioned if the fence went well with the old-fashioned street lights. Curtis stated the split-rail fence is not currently in the CLT District. Fresinski stated that although the Village has bought into the split-rail fence, it can also be changed. Ward suggested shrubs and forget the split-rail fence in the CLT District. Wolf stated shrubs are still desirable on private property. The consensus of the group was to omit the split-rail fence.

Page 5: Labels for bottom diagram inadvertently omitted, but it is essentially the cover picture repeated. Curtis noted that with the N. Triphammer Road Reconstruction, maneuvering of vehicles within the lanes will be more complicated and signs should be easier to read or larger. Wolf stated the signs would be larger and the Village would determine where they are placed. Curtis stated that Cornell uses brown and white signs which are easy to read and are located between the sidewalks and streets. Stycos asked where the directional signs would be placed. Wolf responded that she could see them at each of the street intersections but especially when coming off the Route 13 bridge. She also stated smaller signs with the same motif could be installed at the Village Center, installed by individual businesses, and be placed on overhead signs as well.

Page 6: Wolf noted that Item No. 2 states a 12 ft. wide tree line but that is beyond the public ROW and onto private property so it needs to be scaled back. Edwards expressed concerns about locating the Village Center on the corner of Oakcrest Road when the corner of Graham Road is already established with businesses on all four sides and is more central. He feels the corner with the unoccupied restaurant would be a good location for the Fire Station. Waterman was unsure if that property would be large enough for a Fire Station and a Community Center. Curtis stated that the YMCA has been looking for a site for ball fields. Ward stated that often today a Village Center is not located in the center of the village. Klepack stated that this area was considered for the Center as the Village Office is already in that area and it would be appealing for an open park space.

Page 7: Dankert noted that for Item No. 3, there would have to be heavy involvement with the Lansing Fire Commissioners and it is not a decision the Village could make unilaterally. Curtis feels the timing may be right because money has been allocated to upgrade the fire station on Oakcrest. Wolf stated this section should be written to suggest considering movement of the fire station in joint consultation with the Lansing Fire Commissioners. Dankert will provide correct wording to Curtis and will check into the Fire Department's reaction to this concept. Stycos asked what is the advantage to relocating the Fire Station. Wolf responded that one of the advantages would be to provide an opportunity to add meeting room space in the same building if the Fire Station were to be rebuilt. It would also provide a park for the Village. Dankert noted that the Fire Station needs at a minimum to be upgraded. Waterman also noted that the fire trucks would no longer be exiting across from the Smidt residence on Oakcrest Road. Ward stated the desire of fire departments is to be on major routes rather than feeder roads. Curtis noted a larger Fire Station might also be used to attract bunkers.

Page 8: Klepack and Wolf previously discussed Item 1.2 and Wolf recommended 20 ft. on private property as that was the height for the light poles. Fresinski stated that the Cornell campus is not well lit and he is unclear if it is due to height of poles, type of lighting, wattage, etc. Wolf stated that foot candles are important to ascertain that there is enough lighting on a property and there are guidelines for this incorporated into the document. Klepack was unclear as

to where the 20 ft. high signs would be placed with the trees being in the same area. Marchesseault stated the signs could be placed along the same line and is usually placed at the entrances to the site. Curtis noted the building mounted signs as proposed could not extend above the cornice line and he was unclear what exactly would constitute the cornice line; currently signs can not extend above the roof line and that is relatively easy to determine. Halevy stated the Lighting Commission is responsible for street lighting and parking lot lighting. Wolf stated that when there is a Law change required, such as in Item 1.2, it will be noted in italics and the specific law and section noted.

Page 9: Curtis and Wolf have spoken and Item 3.6 will be revised to comply with New York State handicap requirements.

Page 10: Wolf stated the drawings show the parking lot setbacks as they currently exist. They are suggesting retaining the parking lot setbacks but are allowing the building to move forward to that line. Tree plantings are also shown and she is recommending these diagrams also be included as part of the Guidelines. Curtis questioned Item No. 4.3 and why landscape designs without berms were being recommended as he knows of several situations where berms have been used effectively in the Village. Wolf stated that some have been used well but often it is used in a way that looks unnatural. Ward states it sometimes looks cheap. Curtis stated the CFCU used a berm which was very effective. He has also seen masonry walls with berming used together for Village Office Campus and CFCU and they were done well. Wolf stated it is often preferable to have a hedge. Ward stated the current berm in front of the old McDonalds is poor. Wolf will expound on this area in the document. Klepack recommended leaving out the wording prohibiting berms.

Page 11: Halevy provided comments from Reinhart to Wolf for her review. Ward noted that the Oakcrest Road residents do not want lights and the document states they will go as far as the Fire Station. Curtis noted that metal halide lights were not recommended in the past. Curtis questioned why the concrete light pole footers should not extend more than 6 in. above the finished grade and Wolf responded that it was for aesthetics.

Page 12: Halevy stated that Hickey had comments regarding this page, Items 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4, and he desired illustrations. Wolf stated photographs would be most effective here. Ward stated that in Columbus Ohio, the requirements specify building materials and in order to build a business along the thoroughfares, they must have a brick façade, although he personally prefers natural materials. Wolf stated that natural materials, such as wood or brick, is preferred by the Village. Ward would like to see a listing of preferred materials as he does not like white block or brick like those of McDonalds or Tops. The consensus was that earth tones or natural colors are preferred and highly reflective surfaces or bright surfaces are unacceptable. Curtis asked for clarification on Item 1.3. Wolf stated the N. Triphammer Rd. side of McDonalds is a 75-80% flat unarticulated surface wall although the north end is glass. Wolf stated about 1/3 of the wall should be windows, arcades or awnings to break up the wall.

Page 13: Waterman stated that some notes regarding mixed use (Sections 4) are not part of the Guideline and should go on a separate memorandum. Dankert recommended making Item 1.5 consistent with the last page.

Halevy stated that his understanding is this was the last Focus Group and now Wolf will be redrafting the Design Guidelines for submission to the Planning Board who will then decide whether or not to hold a Public Hearing. After their approval, it will be passed to the Trustees who will determine whether they will or will not hold a Public Hearing. Klepack stated it might be Wolf who will make the presentation to the Board of Trustees. Curtis also noted it might be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. Wolf stated this would be a question for the Trustees and the Attorney.

Wolf passed out copies of the diagrams which will be incorporated into the final document. The meeting was adjourned.