

**Village of Lansing  
Planning Board Meeting  
March 13, 2006**

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, Carol Klepack and Alternate Member Mario Tomei; Trustee Liaison Lynn Leopold; Attorney David Dubow; Engineer Brent Cross; Code Enforcement Officer Ben Curtis and members of the public.

-  
**Tomei as Member:**

First, Hickey appointed Alternate Member Tomei to serve as an acting Planning Board member at tonight's meeting due to the absence of Board Member Maria Stycos.

-  
**Public Comment:**

Hickey opened the Public Comment period. As there was no one present who wished to speak, Dankert moved to close the Public Comment period. Seconded by Brown. Ayes by Brown, Dankert, Hickey and Tomei. Motion carried.

**Public Hearing - Special Permit No. 2105, Cayuga Medical Center Addition:**

The first item on the agenda was a Public Hearing for Cayuga Medical Center to construct an 885 sf addition to the existing Convenient Care and Imaging Center at 10 Arrowwood Drive in the Human Health Services District, Tax Parcel No. 45.1-1-57.3

Curtis noted for the records that he has received Proof of Mailing from the applicants as well as the 239 review from the County indicating they have no objections or comments for the proposed project.

Paul Levesque from HOLT Architects made the presentation for the applicant. Levesque stated there would be a small addition constructed in a courtyard area. It would be about 885 sf. and would only have a short exterior wall in one location. The architecture would be the same as what presently exists for the rest of the building. There would be a couple of windows and exit door in the addition. There would be no landscaping as they are simply filling in a courtyard area mostly surrounded by interior space. The addition would be for storage of equipment for SurgiCare and would not require deliveries of any kind. Currently items are being stored in office areas and they would like to return the areas to an office use again.

Hickey opened the Public Hearing. As there was no one present who wished to speak, Tomei moved to close the Public Hearing. Seconded by Dankert. Ayes by Brown, Dankert, Hickey and Tomei. Motion carried.

Cross stated he has reviewed the plan and the addition was a minor project but with the cumulative impact of the several additions approved on the site, more and more area is becoming impermeable. Levesque stated the last time they came before the Board for the SurgiCare addition, they installed an oversized detention pond to offset the cumulative impact of the additions and this small addition will remain well within the limits. Levesque stated he could obtain another letter if the Board so desired. Cross stated that he might consider requiring one if another project is proposed for this site.

Next, the Board did its SEQRA review of the Short EAF submitted by the applicant. On Part I, Item 9, additional items to be checked include residential, commercial and other. On part II, answers were as follows: A - No, B - No, C1 - No, C2 - No, the project will blend with the existing buliding. C3 - None C4 - No, C5 - None C6 - None C7 - No, D - No, E - No.

Brown moved the following resolution, seconded by Tomei:

**VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SEQR REVIEW OF SPECIAL PERMIT  
NO. 2105 ADOPTED ON MARCH 13, 2006**

**WHEREAS:**

- A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Special Permit 2105, Cayuga Medical Center to construct an 885 square foot addition to the Convenient Care and Imaging Center at 10 Arrowwood Drive in the Human Health Services District, Tax Parcel No. 45.1-1-57.3; and
- B. This proposed action is an Unlisted Action for which the Village of Lansing Planning Board is an involved agency for the purposes of environmental review; and
- C. On March 13, 2006, the Village of Lansing Planning Board, in performing the lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"), (i) thoroughly reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment Form (the "Short EAF"), Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review (including any Visual Environmental Assessment Form required), (ii) thoroughly analyzed the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), and (iii) completed the Short EAF, Part II;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:**

1. The Village of Lansing Planning Board, based upon (i) its thorough review of the Short EAF, Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review (including any Visual Environmental Assessment Form required), (ii) its thorough review of the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), and (iii) its completion of the Short EAF, Part II, including the findings noted thereon (which findings are incorporated herein as if set forth at length), hereby makes a negative determination of environmental significance ("**NEGATIVE DECLARATION**") in accordance with SEQR for the above referenced proposed action, and determines that neither a Full Environmental Assessment Form, nor an Environmental Impact Statement will be required; and:
2. The Responsible Officer of the Village of Lansing Planning Board is hereby authorized and directed to complete and sign as required the Short EAF, Part III, confirming the foregoing **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, which fully completed and signed Short EAF shall be attached to and made a part of this Resolution.

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

**AYES: Phil Dankert, Ned Hickey, Doris Brown and Mario Tomei**

**NAYS: none**

The motion was declared to be carried.

Next, the Board reviewed the 10 General Conditions for a Special Permit found in Village Code Section 145-59 E of the Zoning Law. Dankert moved that the applicant has met the General Conditions required for all Special Permits. Seconded by Brown. All aye.

Tomei moved the following resolution, seconded by Brown:

**VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 2105 ADOPTED  
ON MARCH 13, 2006**

**WHEREAS:**

- A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Special Permit 2105, Cayuga Medical Center to construct an 885 square foot addition to the Convenient Care and Imaging Center at 10 Arrowwood Drive in the Human Health Services District, Tax Parcel No. 45.1-1-57.3; and
- B. On March 13, 2006, the Village of Lansing Planning Board determined that the proposed action is an Unlisted Action for which the Board is an involved agency, and in performing the lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"), the Board (i) thoroughly reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment Form (the "Short EAF"), Part 1, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review (including any Visual Environmental Assessment Form required), (ii) thoroughly analyzed the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), (iii) completed the Short EAF, Part 2; and (iv) made a negative determination of environmental significance ("Negative Declaration") in accordance with SEQR for the above referenced proposed action and determined that an Environmental Impact Statement would not be required; and
- C. On March 13, 2006, the Village of Lansing Planning Board held a public hearing regarding this proposed action, and thereafter thoroughly reviewed and analyzed (i) the materials and information presented by and on behalf of the applicant in support of this proposed action, including information and materials related to the environmental issues, if any, which the Board deemed necessary or appropriate for its review, (ii) all other information and materials rightfully before the Board, and (iii) all issues raised during the public hearing and/or otherwise raised in the course of the Board's deliberations; and
- D. On March 13, 2006, in accordance with Section 7-725-b of the Village Law of the State of New York and Sections 145.59, 145.60, 145.60.1 and 145.61 of the Village of Lansing Code, the Village of Lansing Planning Board, in the course of its further deliberations, reviewed and took into consideration (i) the general conditions required for all special permits (Village of Lansing Code Section 145.59E), (ii) any applicable conditions required for certain special permit uses (Village of Lansing Code Section 145.60), and (iii) any applicable conditions required for uses within a Combining District (Village of Lansing Code Section 145.61);

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOW:**

1. The Village of Lansing Planning Board hereby finds (subject to the conditions and requirements, if any, set forth below) that the proposed action meets (i) all general conditions required for all special permits (Village of Lansing Code Section 145.59E), (ii) any applicable conditions required for certain special permit uses (Village of Lansing Code Section 145.60), and (iii) any applicable conditions required for uses within a Combining District (Village of Lansing Code Section 145.61); and
2. It is hereby determined by the Village of Lansing Planning Board that Special Permit No. 2105 is **GRANTED AND APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions and requirements:

**none**

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

**AYES: Phil Dankert, Ned Hickey, Doris Brown and Mario Tomei**

**NAYS: none**

The motion was declared to be carried.

**Parking Lot Lighting Requirements** - Continued Discussion:

Dankert stated that he and Curtis have had discussions especially regarding the new cardiology building where the proposed lighting provides no illumination for the handicapped parking area. Dankert felt there would be times when the facility is open in the evening hours when it is dark. Curtis found a good simple Light Plan from another municipality which includes standards for minimum lighting as well as some other information that might improve the Village's Lighting Guidelines. Hickey stated the Village reviewed the 1997 Lighting Guidelines which were drafted by Steve Halevy, but they were never formally adopted. Hickey feels all lighting requirements should be placed in one document and useful elements of the Lighting Plan Curtis found as well should be incorporated with the 1997 Guidelines and submitted to the Trustees for adoption. Curtis also provided information regarding State lighting regulations for ATM facilities. These can be incorporated by reference into the Village guidelines without getting into the specifics. Hickey feels the Lighting Commission should take the two existing documents and blend them into a draft copy for review by the Planning Board. It will then be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for their approval. Dubow stated the Town of Ithaca is in the process of creating such a document and if their Planning Department has already written a document, the Village might want to use their information. Dankert will contact Jonathan Kanter of the Town of Ithaca Planning Department. Brown asked about residential security lighting. Hickey stated if there is a problem with light shining from one property onto another, Curtis would enforce the Zoning Law as it applies to light trespass.

Curtis stated he and Superintendent of Public Works John Courtney will be setting up a meeting with the Trust Company and the Lighting Commission to review their lighting at their branch. Board members also discussed situations where light trespass might be beneficial such as lighting that adds illumination for existing sidewalks.

(Klepack entered the meeting.)

**Frontage Requirements in CHT and CLT Districts:**

Curtis provided Board members with a memo on this topic prior to the meeting. Curtis was working with the cardiology building and realized that the amount of frontage may be deficient for two tenants though it was sufficient for one use. In the CHT and CLT Districts street frontage is required to be 100 feet or 60 feet for each tenant or use. Also the minimum lot size is 10,000 sf for one use or tenant and 6,000 sf per tenant or use for more than one use or tenant. Hickey stated at Lansing Village Place there is one driveway to serve many tenants. Hickey stated that off-street parking is based on the square footage or use of a building and is not based on the number of tenants. Hickey stated the original Zoning Law probably was a cut and paste project and often the details were not carefully considered in the haste to get something on the books when the Village was formed. Dubow stated that frontage is usually a density question. Looking at current conditions and standards should be the guideline for the Board in their review. As an example, Dubow stated that if MoldFlow went out of business and the owner decided to lease the building to two or more tenants, frontage might then be deficient even though there might be no increase in the amount of traffic or the number of employees. Curtis stated that as the law presently exists, there would only be three tenants allowed in the Small Mall. Cross stated the Village of Cayuga Heights does not have provisions requiring minimum frontage for each tenant but instead has a minimum frontage requirement based on the use. The Board then went on to discuss the CLT and CHT minimum requirements for lot size where the minimum lot size is 10,000 sf., but 6,000 sf per tenant or use for more than one use or tenant. Curtis noted that there are setback requirements and parking requirements which limit the density of development on a property. He also commented that the language which states tenant or use is confusing. Hickey stated the feeling of the Board seems to be to remove the provisions basing frontage and area requirements on the number of uses or tenants. Curtis was in agreement with this as the language is confusing he feels he would be unable to explain the rationale if someone asked him. Dubow was asked to draft a local law amendment to remove these provisions.

Dubow stated the Human Health Services District should also be included when redrafting the new law as the current

zoning dimension provisions of the CLT District are also applicable to the HHS District.

**Recreation Land, Legal Requirements** - Continued Discussion:

Hickey stated requirements for dedication of recreation land was discussed at a previous meeting particularly with regard to establishing findings. Hickey feels comfortable with the process so far regarding the Bolton Estate, noting that the Comprehensive Plan references the area in terms of the Greenway Plan and lake access, and that the Village has previously undertaken a study of how recreation land might be developed on the property.

Hickey stated that Curtis has received a telephone call from the lawyer for the Dart Estate. The heirs for the property would like to close out the estate and are anticipating a subdivision of the large tract of land of 50-60 acres to distribute among the three heirs. Some parts of the land are more fit for development than others. Some of the individual owners may develop their parcels and others may not.

Hickey stated this would be a major subdivision because it is proposed to divide the land into three parcels. Dubow stated when the land is subdivided, the Planning Board may not be permitted to require a sketch plan for future roads and development as such improvements are not being proposed at this time. Dubow stated when one of the new owners comes in to subdivide and develop their parcel, then the Planning Board can request a sketch plan showing roads and connectivity of the lot to the surrounding area. Curtis stated he has made the Executor aware of the need for two means of access if a development includes 20 or more units as access to Dart Drive is limited. Cross thought there were regulations as to the number of times a lot could be subdivided before requiring County review. Dubow stated that there are State laws which require a parcel divided into more than 5 lots to be approved by the County Health Department. Dubow stated the Planning Board should encourage the current subdividers to let the Village know what is contemplated for the entire parcel if and when they have some idea. Hickey stated that within the area of Wood Thrush Hollow Road, Warren Road, Dart Drive and Graham Road, nearly 1/3 of the population of the Village resides and there is no park in that area. Hickey stated there will be one in the Lansing Trails area but that is intended to serve Lansing Trails.

Hickey and Klepack have talked and agree that the Greenway Plan should really be the Greenway Recreation Plan as it deals with parks as well as the greenways. Brown would also like to see the viewshed on the Sun Downs Farm property protected when that land is developed. Hickey stated the viewshed has been identified as the pond/willow area which comprises approximately 13 acres. Hickey stated this area has been designated in the Greenway Plan. Although recreation opportunities are clearly needed in the Dart Drive area, no particular sites or connective trails have been identified. Hickey and Klepack will work on this. There was discussion as to the boundary line separating the Ithaca and Lansing school districts which traverses this property and may have some impact on the way it is developed.

**2006 Goals:**

Leopold stated that under the EPA Phase 2 Stormwater Regulations, the Village needs to work closely with its engineers to incorporate the DEC requirements into Village law. Leopold is continuing to work on this. Leopold stated there is money budgeted by the Village to accomplish this once it is determined what the Village needs to do. The County received a grant to evaluate the laws in all municipalities in the County for compliance and she has spoken with Nick Schipanski, the consultant doing this work, and he says the Village is in pretty good shape. There is work, however, that must be done.

**Approval of Minutes** - February 13 and 28:

Dankert moved to approve the minutes of February 13th as revised. Seconded by Klepack. Ayes by Brown, Dankert, Hickey, Klepack and Tomei. Minutes approved.

Klepack moved to approve the minutes of February 28th as revised. Seconded by Dankert. Ayes by Brown, Dankert, Klepack and Tomei with Hickey abstaining because he was not present at that meeting. Minutes approved.

**Reports:**

*Board of Trustees:* Dankert did not attend as the agenda items such as election date, approval of minutes, and

preliminary budget were not applicable to this Board.

**Other Business as Time Permits:**

Planning Board members will be walking the Bolton Estate to familiarize themselves with the property, look at recreation land and evaluate the feasibility of locations for trails. Dankert has enlisted the assistance of a trail specialist from the Cayuga Trail Club. Dankert will coordinate this field trip and make sure any applicable requirements of the Open Meetings Law are followed.

Leopold is concerned about the amount of paperwork provided to this Board by developers and that much of it is single-sided. Curtis will inform applicants that the Board prefers less and double-sided submissions.

-

**Adjournment:**

Klepack moved to adjourn at 8:35 P.M. Seconded by Tomei. Ayes by Brown, Dankert, Hickey, Klepack and Tomei. Motion carried.