

**Village of Lansing
Planning Board Meeting
July 30, 2002**

The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 P.M. by Chairman Ned Hickey. Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Doris Brown, Phil Dankert and Maria Stycos; Attorney William Troy; Village Engineer Brent Cross; and Code Enforcement Officer Ben Curtis.

Public Comment:

Hickey opened the Public Comment. No one present wished to speak. Dankert moved to close the Public Comment period. Seconded by Brown. All aye.

Special Permit No. 1750, JSW Realty, Office & Lab. Building, Thornwood Dr.:

The first item on the agenda was a Public Hearing to consider Special Permit No. 1750, JSW Realty, LLC to construct a 35,350 sf office and laboratory building at 35 Thornwood Drive, in the Business and Technology District, Tax Parcel No. 45.1-1-55.2. Tom LiVigne, Manager of Operations for Cornell Real Estate Department, gave the presentation. LiVigne stated that Cornell is entering a joint venture with Welliver McGuire to construct a building within the Business and Technology Park. It is one of the remaining lots within the park and will be a brick single story L-shaped building. The proposed tenants thus far will be International Food Network (research oriented), Viral Therapeutics (research oriented), and a small engineering firm. LiVigne stated after the current anchor tenants utilize their space, there will be about 15000 sf remaining which will be available to others desiring space in the park.

The lot is almost 4.19 acres and Cornell is proposing to have 116 parking spaces with a reserve to bring it up to 146 parking spaces if additional parking is needed. The number of parking spaces was calculated by 50% of the building being office space and 50% being laboratory space. Walkways will also connect to the park walkway system presently in place.

Hickey opened the Public Comment period. No one wished to speak. Brown moved to close the Public Comment period. Seconded by Stycos. All aye.

Cross has reviewed the site plans and made his presentation. He had five areas he addressed. (1) Regarding parking, the in and out driveway width was scaled at 22 ft and 24 ft. is required for two-way traffic. Cross would also recommend installation of a stop sign at the outlet of the front parking lot since the driveway acts as a service road to both parking lots. Curtis asked about the number of parking spaces for future use if it all becomes office space and 177 parking spaces are required. Craig Hopkins stated that the building is designed to accommodate the businesses as they grow. LiVigne stated the parking would need to be reconfigured in the future if additional spaces are required and there is space available to do this although they would prefer not to do it at this time. Curtis will write the permit for 45% laboratory space which will comply with the number of parking spaces. (2) Regarding stormwater management, Cross observed that there is no on-site storm water retention. Cross will revisit the site to see if water discharged into the ditch line connects to the pond with a culvert. Hickey felt the water would eventually go to the stream that runs through Mrs. Dart's property. Cross stated that this discharge of water from the B & T Park has been a concern for a number of buildings in the park. Hickey stated that the developers must address and satisfy the concerns of Cross before a permit will be issued. Cross stated the calculation of the required capacity of the first pond was based on an assumption of a build-out with 50% impervious surface and this project comes to 46 or 48% but with the extra spaces which might be required in the future, it could be over the limit. (3) Regarding the dumpster, there are no details provided for it at this point and he will require a detail to determine if access and screening are sufficient. (4) Photometric plans must be submitted to the Lighting Commission for their review. (5) Cross will require a calculation of the estimated water consumption to determine the number of sewer units that will be required.

Hickey also noted there is no Landscaping Plan. The Board will review it at a later time and will make it a condition of the CO that it meets the approval of the Board.

Troy noted for the record that he has been retained to represent Welliver McGuire in two litigation matters but feels it would not be a conflict in rendering impartial advice on this case.

Hickey asked about the trees on the site plan and wanted to know how many significant trees would be removed. Hopkins responded that there would not be clear cutting and there are 21 significant trees and 12 of them would be removed. Hickey responded that these 12 trees would need to be replaced and the plans should indicate where the replacement trees would be placed.

The Board completed the SEQR. A No. B No. C-1 No. Any concerns of the Village Engineer will be satisfied. C-2 No. It fits what the park is designed for. C-3 No. C-4 No C-5 No. C-6 None. C-7 None. C-8 No.

Dankert moved that the Board finds that this proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts. Seconded by Brown. All aye.

The Board then reviewed the General Conditions for all Special Permits. Dankert moved that the Board finds that the applicant has met the General Conditions specified in Section 304.05 of the Zoning Law. Seconded by Brown. All aye.

Hickey noted that since the building is adjacent to Route 13, the County Planning Department must do a 239 Review to determine if it has any impact on the state and the County report dated 7/24/02 states the project will have no adverse effects.

Special Permit No. 1751, Lowell Garner, Pembroke Lane House:

The second item on the agenda was a Public Hearing to consider Special Permit No. 1751, Lowell Garner to construct a 6500 sf house at 9 Pembroke Lane in the Low Density Residential District, Tax Parcel No. 48.1-2-2.5. A Special Permit is required because the proposed construction is within 200 ft. of the center line of a designated stream and because the lot includes steep slopes.

The architect, Lane Chambliss, described the project. He stated the residence was placed as far away from the creek as possible while still allowing for a walkout basement. There would be a silt fence installed during construction. Hickey requested that Cross be provided with the details of the silt fencing.

Hickey opened the Public Comment period. No one wished to speak. Brown moved to close the Public Comment period. Seconded by Dankert. All aye.

Cross has reviewed the site plans and made his presentation. He had four areas he addressed. (1) Regarding drainage, there are issues during and after construction. Cross will review the details of the silt fence which Chambliss gave to him at the meeting. Cross will also review the silt fence prior to and during construction. Cross is also concerned regarding erosion in the spring since this will be a 6 month project beginning this fall. (2) Cross would also like assurances that there will be ground cover planted upon completion of the project. (3) Cross requested specific details for discharge pipes for footer drains and roof leaders. Chambliss responded they would discharge to daylight and washed stone would be used to prevent erosion. (4) Cross stated he is confused regarding the notation for the permanent drainage easement of 2,940 sf near the road. Chambliss stated it was on the original plat from TG Millers. Cross is unclear whether it was ever addressed.

Cross asked about the removal of trees. Lowell Garner, the owner, stated some pines would be removed along with a few ash and oak. Garner stated the majority of the large trees are below the construction site. Hickey recommended the dead trees be removed.

Stycos asked why the house was so close to the stream and slope. Garner responded that the house might be as close as 32 ft. to 150 ft. from the stream although the terrace might be closer. Chambliss stated this house was set on this location on this site to minimize cut and fill and also allow for a walkout basement. Hickey stated the Board is charged with protecting streamlines and must be convinced that it is necessary to locate this close to the stream.

Chambliss stated that the greatest distance from the center of the stream to the property line is less than 200 ft. so it would be difficult to place the residence anywhere on the property and still stay 200 ft. away from the stream. Hickey stated Board members are concerned about having the residence so close to the stream. Hickey stated having the residence staked off would be helpful to the Board so they could visualize the project. Cross also suggested the cross sections of the house show the existing grade and final grade and creek in proportion to it.

Garner stated he would like to begin construction in mid to late September. Since there is not an immediate rush, Hickey recommended the Board table this until the Aug. 12 meeting after everyone has had the opportunity to review the site.

Belcher Subdivision:

Hickey stated the Belcher Subdivision on Cayuga Heights Road needs to be classified. Ed Crossmore was unable to attend, so his associate, Don Crittenden presented the project. Hickey asked if the parcel to be conveyed to Durst was going to be joined to Durst's current property at 1040 Cayuga Heights Road and Crittenden stated he thought it would be and there is a purchase offer. Hickey stated it must be joined or this would be a major subdivision. Curtis stated the parcel would have access to East Shore Drive but the parcel would be too small to be a building lot in an unsewered area. Troy felt it was important to join the two parcels and this could be classified with the understanding that the two Durst parcels become joined.

Dankert moved to classify the Belcher Subdivision as a minor subdivision on the condition that the parcel which is listed on the application to be conveyed to Durst be joined to the other Durst property at 1040 Cayuga Heights Road. Seconded by Stycos. All aye.

Curtis provided Crittenden with the list of properties and legal notices which must be mailed. Curtis stated the applicants may come to the Board to merge the two Belcher parcels at this time also if that is their intention.

Greenberg Address:

Curtis referenced a letter from Greenberg which included reference to another lot uphill from his residence. Curtis stated Greenberg has previously taken three parcels and joined them into two lots. Curtis took the plat to the Assessment Department and they confirmed that they had mistakenly recorded the subdivision as resulting in four lots and they will be correcting it to show two lots – the Greenberg lot and the Abrams lot. Stycos moved to number the Greenberg residence as 55 Twin Glens Road. Seconded by Brown. All aye.

CHT Parking Lots:

Dankert looked into the issue of parking lot guidelines for commercial development. Dankert stated regarding the size of parking lots, there are no specific guidelines or formulas and maintaining some flexibility can be useful. Each lot should be designed independently and some cities require lots to be broken up. Regarding standards for the dimensions of individual parking spaces, there are many factors to be considered. They should include vehicle size and proposed use of the lot. Aisle dimensions also vary. There are also differing opinions on landscaping strips between aisles. Ring roads provide circulation around the lots and dead end aisles should be avoided. In summary, each situation should be considered individually. Hickey feels there should be some general criteria which would apply. Hickey recommended the key points be placed on a one-page document or checklist for use when reviewing a parking lot. Brown would like to see more done with the perimeters of the parking areas to provide for muffling of sound and fume and light reduction.

CLT Uses:

Hickey directed the Board members' attention to the material submitted by Klepack. Her first recommendation was to delete Item No. 30, Warehousing/Storage/Distribution, (in Section 602, Chart of Uses, in the Zoning Law) from Uses Permitted with Special Permit: General and Additional Conditions in the CLT. Board members agreed. Klepack recommended allowing Item No. 32, Commercial Assembly Soft Goods, as a Use Permitted with Special Permit: General and Additional Conditions. Hickey noted it is difficult to make a list of allowable types of commercial activities and it is easier to list what is not allowed. Klepack recommended permitting Item 34, Research/Design/Prototype Production with a Special Permit. Hickey felt these should be in the Research District and in the Business and Technology District. Curtis noted that the Research District included only the Ornithology Lab

and the grounds around it. Hickey agreed with adding Research/Design/Prototype Production to CLT.

Hickey gave Board members his idea sheet to generate discussion and the Board reviewed it. In it he proposed breaking the CLT into two subdistricts, CLT-1 and CLT-2 where CLT-1 would be the same as the current CLT and CLT-2 would permit some additional uses including small scale retail consistent with adjoining CHT and the intent of the CLT. Brown stated she liked the idea of clustering but it sounds like an upscale mall. Troy cautioned that spot zoning could be a concern. Hickey stated the minimum buffer size could be increased from 25 ft. to 75 ft. where it abuts a residential area. Troy recommended CLT-1 and CLT-2 be separated by Oakcrest Road. Hickey stated that he devised the proposed boundaries on the significant criterion that CLT 2 could only be accessed from a CHT district. Cross asked if one of the goals was to provide access through the CHT, wouldn't the CHT property owner's approval be needed. Hickey stated that their approval would have to be in place.

The Board discussed the minimum lot size of 7500 sf and whether it is too large or too small. Hickey also envisioned some small shops, possibly with housing on the second floor. Hickey asked the Board to review the idea sheet as well as the maps and discussion will continue when the full Board is present.

Planning Board Goals 2002-2003:

Hickey is continuing to work on the 2002-2003 goals and included on-going goals. Hickey also included objectives. (1) Review Comprehensive Plan. Hickey will split it into sections and each member will provide comments on their section, then discussion and revision, and then a Public Hearing will be held. (2) Visual environment. Board members to attend presentation in the fall and then develop a definition and begin work on the criteria for evaluating the impact on visual environment. (3) Review permitted uses in CLT district. Board is working on this at the present. (4) Investigate the feasibility of enhancing the architectural designs for CLT Design Guidelines. Board needs to do follow-up and get consultant if needed. (5) Intersection of Cayuga Heights Rd./Burdick Hill Rd./Route 34. Dave Putnam, TG Millers, has a Conceptual Plan for improving this intersection and Hickey has requested he provide it to the Board for review. (6) Evaluate traffic calming measures. Discussion as to the possibility of having Dart Drive be one-way and the Janivar Drive area having a s-curve. (7) Finish Design Guidelines for Parking Areas.

New York State Planning Federation Conferences:

Discussion on the conference. Curtis, Brown, Dankert, Hickey and possibly Stycos are considering leaving on Sept. 29th and returning after the workshops on 30th and will look into van rental. Klepack is interested in attending from Sept. 29th till Oct. 2nd. Now that there is a possibility of renting a van, she may reconsider.

Approval of Minutes – June 30 & July 8:

The Board reviewed the June 30th minutes. No vote was taken as there was not a quorum of members present who were at the June 30th meeting.

The Board reviewed the July 8th minutes. Stycos moved to accept the minutes as revised. Seconded by Brown. All aye.

Reports:

Trustees: Brown reported used computer is priced at \$50. The Board accepted the insurance proposal from Bailey Insurance and raised the water and sewer surcharge to 33% from 22%. Brown stated the engineer's report discussed the entrance to Sevanna Park and widening it further north. Brown could not understand why there is a need for this and feels it is unnecessary. Curtis stated there has been a long-standing problem there with emergency vehicles because there is only one address for the entire parcel. Brown does not feel this explains why the Village is interested in owning the walkway and roadway into the apartments. Hickey stated this might allow the Highgate Circle residents walking the trail to get to N. Triphammer road without trespassing on private property. Hickey will get information on this topic. Troy feels the purpose may be to provide residents with a left turning lane.

Regarding the Tree Inventory, Hickey stated he did not feel the Trustees paid much attention to it. Hickey has recommended the Village have a maintenance plan and someone be hired to remove the trees on municipal land which need removal as well as other trees. The Mayor has agreed to this and a company has been hired. Hickey and Clerk

Dake will devise a maintenance program to give to the Mayor for his review. Hickey stated there are also other areas of the Village which have not been inventoried.

Other Business as Time Permits:

Stycos stated she is pleased to see the Bradley vs Village BZA case regarding the Target Store was dismissed.

Curtis provided Board members with material regarding the Army Corps of Engineers.

Adjournment:

Dankert moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 P.M. Seconded by Stycos. All aye.

AN IDEA SHEET
Permitted Uses- Commercial Low Traffic

I. Types of Uses

Agricultural Retail
Village Oriented Shop
Small Appliance Sales/Repair
Bakery
Retail Specialty (see definition below)
Variety & Hardware (no lumber or outside storage)
Specialty- Cultural Shopping Center
Mixed Use

II. Definitions

Retail Specialty Shops including but not limited to, the sale of gifts, antiques, flowers, books, jewelry, wearing apparel, tobacco & related supplies, or craft shops making articles exclusively for sale at retail on the premises. See Special Conditions.

III. Special Exceptions

Any use of a nature similar to the above when approved by the Planning Board and through Special Permit process using the General Conditions required for all Special Permits as well as the following criteria required for Special Conditions.

- A. The proposed use is of similar architectural scale to existing development in the district or will use an existing building for its purpose.
- B. Access to the proposed site must be from a site in the Commercial High Traffic District.
- C. Anticipated noise and congestion by the use will be comparable to the levels created by the uses permitted in Section I.
- D. The proposed use will not attract large volumes of traffic nor require more than one curb cut for vehicular access.
- E. Minimum visual and functional conflict will be created between the proposed use and nearby uses.
- F. Minimum buffer zone – 25 feet
- G. No access to Oakcrest road.
- H. All development of parcels must be consistent with Section B, Design Guidelines, Village of Lansing Commercial Low Traffic District Guidelines, Village of Lansing, Comprehensive Plan, Appendix E June 2001.
- I. Other Restrictions:
 - 1. Minimum lot area 7500sf
 - 2. Lot Coverage- Building 20%, Impervious Material 70%

IV. Establish two Commercial Low Traffic Districts (see map)

- A. CLT I Area north of Oakcrest Road and east of N. Triphammer Road
No change in permitted uses currently in Zoning Law.

B. CLT II Area south of Oakcrest Road and west of North Triphammer Road permitted plus retail specialty shops (see II)

All uses currently