

**Village of Lansing  
Planning Board Meeting  
January 14, 2008**

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 Carol Klepack, Maria Stycos and Mario Tomei; Village Attorney David Dubow; Village Engineer Brent Cross; Trustee Liaison Lynn Leopold; and Code Enforcement Officer Ben Curtis.

**Public Comment:**

Hickey opened the Public Comment period.

Carla Marceau stated she was observing for the Community Party.

As there was no one else present who wished to speak, Tomei moved to close the Public Comment Period. Seconded by Stycos. Ayes by Hickey, Klepack, Stycos and Tomei. Motion carried.

**Special Permit No. 2244, Integrated Acquisition & Dev., Medical Office Bldg., cont.:**

The next item on the agenda was a continued discussion of Special Permit No. 2244, Integrated Acquisition and Development to construct a 17,000 sf medical office building at 16 Brentwood Drive in the Parkview Health Care Campus in the Human Health Services District, Tax Parcel No. 45.1-1-59.

TG Miller Engineer David Herrick refreshed the Board on the project. In November, the developers presented a master plan for the potential development of Phase I of the multi-phase project in the Human Health Services District. Herrick stated there were outstanding items – configuration of the intersection of the driveway and Brentwood Drive, driving lane widths, access at the Arrowwood intersection, no depiction of utilities, and lack of stormwater management information. The new site plan shows the utilities, has improved the geometry of the Brentwood Drive extension and intersection with the new access drive, and shows the permanent bio-retention facility for stormwater. There are also insets which show an ecogrid shoulder detail at Arrowwood Drive to allow emergency vehicles to enter or exit in case of an emergency. Cross noted that he had previously recommended that the width of the driveways and the distance between the parking aisles should be 24 ft. rather than 22 ft. Herrick would like to request the driveways remain at 22 ft. because 24 ft. encourages speeding as evidenced on Brentwood and Arrowwood Drives. This would also allow for less impervious area and Herrick stated the widths of the driveway could be expanded in the future if needed.

Cross gave his point by point update of the changes to the project. First, Cross stated he did not know if the new configuration of the intersection of Brentwood Drive and the driveway with a gentler curve for Brentwood Drive would address the real question of future traffic. Hickey stated he recalls that the future buildout is for a total of 3 buildings with 36 doctors treating about 100 patients per day. Tony Votak of Cayuga Medical Associates stated that there would be about 9 or 10

doctors at one time seeing about 20 patients per day for about 200 vehicles per day. Hickey stated that when the intersection is in danger of failing or fails, then the intersection must be upgraded. Tom Colbert of Integrated Acquisition and Development indicated agreement with this. Hickey suggested that this agreement be in writing for future Boards. Dubow stated that further development will entail additional special permit approvals which in turn will allow for the opportunity to require that the intersection be changed. Dubow stated the intersection can be realigned in the future. Herrick stated that the traffic generated by this building is not a concern at this time. Cross is concerned about the future development and the unknown traffic loads and patterns. Cross feels that two driveways in close proximity is not good and it would be better to combine them for one curb cut onto Brentwood Drive. Herrick stated this might lead to stacking if there were only one driveway. Cross stated the Village is concerned about their ROW and is not concerned about vehicles stacking on Cornell's property if there was only one driveway. Klepack asked what the proximity of the two driveways is. Herrick responded that they are 160-180 ft. apart. Cross again expressed concerns about the close proximity of the two driveways on the outside of the curve. Colbert stated they acknowledged that they may be required to change the intersection in the future if circumstances so warrant. Returning to the issue of driveway widths, Cross stated he could not remember a project in the past 15 years where a driveway for two way traffic was approved with less than 24 feet width, other than possibly the 911 Center. Cross stated the parking looks adequate and stormwater management has a quality control feature added. Herrick stated that details will be forthcoming on stormwater management. Herrick stated that water that currently goes to Warren Road will be rerouted to the improved channels within the Park to eliminate the problems that occurred along Warren Road in the past. Cross stated the utilities are detailed, but he wondered if the location of new hydrants had been coordinated with the Fire Department. Curtis stated that Chief Scott Purcell of the Lansing Fire Department should be contacted to review the plans. Purcell's response should be forwarded to Curtis as a condition for issuing the Building Permit. Regarding the dumpster, Cross noted that it was relocated and suggested checking with their contracted hauler to be sure the new location would work. Herrick stated the new design was discussed with Superior Disposal and allows for pickup from either the front or back end of a garbage truck. Cross' final comment was about the emergency access shoulder at the intersection of Arrowwood Drive with Warren Road and whether it will be plowed. Hickey responded that he assumed so and again, Purcell should be asked to comment on this. Regarding the width of the driveways, Hickey stated his position that all two-way traffic routes should remain at 24 ft. on the recommendation of the Village Engineer. Herrick continued to pursue the 22 ft. width noting that it could then be modified at a later date if necessary. Herrick stated this is simply an access road or driveway. Leopold stated planting trees close to the edge of the driveway might be a traffic calming measure to give a sense of a narrower driveway. Klepack asked of an example of a 22 ft. driveway as opposed to a 24 ft. driveway. Curtis stated that Pembroke Lane is 18 ft. with shoulders. This item will be held for further discussion.

Hickey stated he received a telephone call from Planning Board member Phil Dankert reminding him that the applicants must provide the cut sheets and photometrics for the lighting plan. Hickey stated the Village has many different types of light poles and would like to standardize what they are responsible for. Leopold stated some types of fixtures are hard to maintain.

Stycos asked about development further to the east on Brentwood Drive and who would be responsible for future changes that might be needed if traffic was a concern. Herrick responded that the traffic could be reviewed at the time each new development was proposed, and it could then be determined what if any changes should be made. Cross stated that in the future, when Cornell approaches the Board to accept road extensions, the Village ROW may need to be changed. Returning to the issue of driveway widths, Hickey stated a 22 ft. width now would be acceptable, but if the 22 ft. width were deemed hazardous, then the road would need to be expanded to 24 ft. Dubow stated that Zoning Law Section 145.20 states that a driveway for a non-residential lot be no more than 24 ft., and for two-way traffic the roadway be no less than 20 ft. Dubow stated the Planning Board would be able to remedy the situation each time there is a new Special Permit application. Cross stated there are two distinct issues concerning the driving widths: where there is parking and where there is no parking. Herrick showed the Board where the 22 and 24 ft. lanes were in the parking area. The 24 ft. width aisles were placed where vehicles are backing from two directions. Where there are vehicles only backing from one direction, the width of the lanes was reduced to 22 ft., and where no cars backed up the width is 22 ft.. Again Cross reiterated the Village's past history of only allowing for 24 ft. width where traffic is two-way. Herrick was agreeable to 24 ft. in most locations, but requested 22 ft. in the location at the west end of the driveway where there were only 10 parking spaces. Herrick stated there is space where lane width could be adjusted in the future. Cross stated there would be 2 more buildings with at least that many driveways to be built to the east in the future. Hickey stated this makes a stronger case for the 24 ft. width for the main access drive. Cross would be willing to concede to 22 ft. at the west end of the driveway and for the short drive connecting to Convenient Care as long as there is 24 ft. on the main driveway and in the parking areas.

Hickey asked about the flow of the water from east to west, and stated that there is a big drainage study being done by the Town of Ithaca for this area. Herrick stated that in 1997 this watershed area was reviewed and there is lots of information on the watershed. This area has been and continues to be monitored by Cornell Professor Tom Walters.

Regarding the Landscaping Plan, Hickey stated that it looked good on paper, but sometimes what goes in the ground looks different from what the Board imagines when looking at the Plan. Klepack commented that the sizes of the plants were good. Leopold recommended street trees closer to the road but not in the ROW. Hickey stated the Village can approve the Landscape Plan as is, but will inspect the as-planted Landscape Plan for overall effect when the time comes.

Hickey stated that the conditions, which will be attached to the special permit, include the road design and parking area changed as discussed at tonight's meeting. Dubow clarified this as a width of 24 ft. in the parking lot and turning areas and the entire length of the driveway up to the beginning of 16 Brentwood Drive parking lot; the remainder of the driveway will be 22 ft. as well as the short drive connecting to Convenient Care. Other conditions will include: final approval of the Village Engineer; approval by the Lighting Commission of the Lighting Plan with the photometrics and cut sheets; review

by Fire Chief Purcell of the intersection of Arrowwood Drive and Warren Road, as well as the fire hydrants and the overall site plan; and approval of Superintendent of Public Works John Courtney on the ecogrid system for the shoulder of Arrowwood Drive at the Warren Road intersection. Hickey stated the area for the emergency access must be plowed and at a meeting with Herman Sieverding and John Courtney, it was decided that the emergency access would be provided by a ten foot one lane width up to the first hydrant. Hickey stated it is up to the applicants to determine the surface, but it should be checked out with Purcell and Courtney.

Curtis asked for clarification on the 22 and 24 ft. widths. Herrick responded that the widths would be 24 in all locations except for the 22 ft. which would go from the west end of the project straightaway to the east end of the parking area, as well as the connection to Convenient Care.

Next, the Board completed the SEQRA Short EAF Form. Part 1 was reviewed and deemed to be accurate. Curtis also noted that the Village has received the County 239 Review. Regarding Part 2, responses were as follows: A – No; B – No; C1 – No, this is subject to review and approval by the Village Engineer; C2 – No; C3 – No; C4 – It is zoned for Human Health District and is being used as such; C5 – None that are anticipated; C6 – None; C7 – None; D – No; and E – No.

Tomei moved the following resolution, second by Klepack:

VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SEQR REVIEW OF  
SPECIAL PERMIT NO. 2244 ADOPTED ON JANUARY 14, 2008

**WHEREAS:**

- A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Special Permit No. 2244, Integrated Acquisition and Development to construct a 17,000 square foot medical office building at 16 Brentwood Drive in the Parkview Health Care Campus in the Human Health Services District, Tax Parcel No. 45.1-1-59; 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 January 14, 2008, 2007, 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: Mario Tomei, Ned Hickey, Maria Stycos and Carol Klepack**

**NAYS: none**

The motion was declared to be carried.

Next the Board reviewed the 10 General Conditions required for a Special Permit as listed in Zoning Law Section 145-59E. Stycos moved that the applicant has met all the General Conditions required for a Special Permit. Seconded by Klepack. Ayes by Hickey, Klepack, Stycos and Tomei. Motion carried.

Dubow stated for the record that the Board received a letter from the County Planning Department dated November 27, 2007 which indicates there would be no negative inter-community or county-wide impacts. The County did recommend that this Board continue to consider traffic issues which the Board has done. Klepack moved the following resolution, second by Stycos:

VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SPECIAL PERMIT NO.  
2244 ADOPTED ON JANUARY 14, 2008

**WHEREAS:**

- A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Special Permit No. 2244, Integrated Acquisition and Development to construct a 17,000 square foot medical office building at 16 Brentwood Drive in the Parkview Health Care Campus in the Human Health Services District, Tax Parcel No. 45.1-1-59; and
- B. On November 12, 2007, Village of Lansing Planning Board initially discussed with the applicant the proposed action and preliminary application materials related thereto, and raised certain issues and matters to be addressed and further evaluated in conjunction with the applicant's formal application and presentation; and
- C. On November 27, 2007, the Village of Lansing Planning Board continued its discussion with the applicant regarding the proposed action, reviewed the formal application materials, held a public hearing regarding this proposed action, and thereafter preliminarily reviewed and analyzed (i) the materials and information presented by and on behalf of the applicant in support of the 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 then rightfully before the Board (including the November 27, 2007 General Municipal Law Section 239 -l and -m response from the Tompkins County Department of Planning), and (iii) all issues raised during the public hearing and/or otherwise raised in the course of the Board's initial deliberations, whereupon it was determined that further information, materials and Board deliberation were required and/or would be appropriate;
- D. On January 14, 2008, the Village of Lansing Planning Board further reviewed and analyzed (i) all materials and information presented by and on behalf of the applicant in support of this proposed action (including any supplemental information and materials submitted following the Board's November 27, 2007 meeting and 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 held on November 12, 2007) and/or otherwise raised in the course of the Board's deliberations;
- E. On January 14, 2008, 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

- F. On January 14, 2008, 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 FOLLOWS:**

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. 2244 is **GRANTED AND APPROVED**, subject to the following conditions and requirements:
  - a) **Review by the Lansing Fire Department, particularly with regard to number and location of fire hydrants, and driveway and parking lot layout.**
  - b) **Approval by the Village Engineer of storm water management plan, erosion control, parking and site work.**
  - c) **Approval of exterior lighting plan by the Village of Lansing Lighting Commission.**

- d) **Approval by the Village of Lansing Superintendent of Public Works of the emergency drive lane at the entrance of the Parkview Health Care Campus.**
- e) **Width of driveways and internal traffic circulation routes shall be increased from 22' to 24' except that the straight driveway section from the west end construction limits to the east end of the parking lot of 16 Brentwood Drive and the driveway connecting 16 Brentwood Drive to 10 Arrowwood Drive shall be no less than 22'.**

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

**AYES: Mario Tomei, Ned Hickey, Maria Stycos and Carol Klepack**

**NAYS: none**

The motion was declared to be carried.

Hickey stated the Board should review the requirements for driveways and roads. Cross will work on recommendations for when 22 ft. might be allowable. Hickey wondered if this should have been considered a road rather than a driveway. Cross noted a water line should be in a dedicated ROW. Board members discussed plan submissions by developers and what should be indicated on the plans for entire projects which might be completed in phases. Dubow stated that Brentwood Drive will remain a public road as it is further developed, although it is unclear at this time where it might go.

-  
-

### **Approval of Minutes**

Stycos moved to approve the minutes of December 10<sup>th</sup> as revised. Seconded by Tomei. Ayes by Hickey, Klepack, Stycos and Tomei. Motion carried.

### **Other Business as Time Permits:**

Leopold stated she has planted the 150 daffodil bulbs donated to the Village mostly near the Tompkins Trust Bank and some near the bench at Pyramid Drive.

Hickey distributed a flyer for a workshop on Feb. 8<sup>th</sup> on the Future Trends in Human Services for anyone who might be interested.

Hickey reviewed the 2008 goals for the Planning Board. Goals include: continued review of Zoning and Subdivision Laws (Cross will work on road widths); Review of Lighting Plan (Dankert);

Continued education and training (David Fernandez will make a presentation on Jan. 29<sup>th</sup> on understanding landscape plans). Hickey noted that reading of packet materials also counts as training. As time permits, the Board will pursue additional training at meetings.

**Reports:**

*Board of Trustees:* Hickey reported the January 7<sup>th</sup> meeting included a Public Hearing for Local Law A regarding the eligibility requirements for senior citizen tax exemptions. Hickey stated the Engineer's Report was about the water tank behind the Village Office. There were three options: 1) have the Village replace the tank at a cost of about \$600,000; 2) share the cost with Bolton Point to put a new tank at Burdick Hill and remove this tank at a cost of about \$700,000 and 3) relocate the tank elsewhere. Mayor Hartill felt repairing the tank was not feasible and he was most favorable to option 2 to share the cost with Bolton Point. This would allow for extra capacity and would service the needs of Village residents. This would also cause the least disruption in service. Hickey stated the Trustees also approved the contract for Bolton Point's participation on the union contract. The meeting then concluded with an Executive Session.

-

Hickey also attended a meeting on Dec. 17<sup>th</sup> where Proposed Local Laws 8,9,10, 11 and 12 of 2007 were passed.

**Other Business as Time Permits:**

Curtis stated his report included an update of housing statistics which indicates the Village continues to be very steady in adding 9-10 houses per year.

Hickey spoke about his concerns for shopping carts abandoned on Graham Road. Dubow stated it is unlawful in NYS to remove carts from the premises if there is a notice stating it is unlawful and the name and telephone number of the vendor is on the cart.

**Adjournment:**

Klepack moved to adjourn at 9:00 P.M. Seconded by Stycos. Ayes by Hickey, Klepack, Stycos and Tomei. Motion carried.