

**Village of Lansing
Planning Board Meeting
January 12, 2009**

1 The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 P.M. by
2 Chairman Ned Hickey. Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Maria Stycos,
3 Phil Dankert, Carol Klepack and Mario Tomei; Alternate Member Richard Durst; Village
4 Engineer Brent Cross; Village Attorney David Dubow; Code Enforcement Officer Ben
5 Curtis; Trustee Liaison Lynn Leopold; Carolyn Kenyon, observing for the Community Party;
6 Paul Grennell, Executive Director of the YMCA and his Architect, Jason Demerest.

7
8 **Public Comment:**

9 Hickey opened the Public Comment Period. Kenyon stated that she was observing on behalf
10 of the Community Party Observers Program. There being no one else who wished to speak,
11 Tomei moved to close the Public Comment Period. Seconded by Dankert. Ayes by Hickey,
12 Dankert, Stycos Klepack and Tomei. Motion carried.

13
14 **Special Permit 2344, YMCA**

15 The next item on the agenda was Special Permit 2344, YMCA, to construct a 3300 square
16 foot addition to their existing building at 20 Graham Road West in the Commercial Low
17 Traffic District, Tax Parcel No. 47.1-1-17.9. The addition consists primarily of an expansion
18 of the second floor within the existing footprint of the building along with a 300 square foot
19 entryway enhancement. The Architect, Jason Demerest, referred the members to the set of
20 plans that was in their packets. He stated that the majority of the space being added is a
21 wellness education facility on the second floor. On the first floor they are proposing to
22 enlarge and reconfigure the vestibule/entryway to provide more control and security and to
23 construct a stairway connecting the vestibule with the new facility on the second floor. The
24 wellness center on the second floor will include a large reception area with rooms for private
25 consultation as well as a common area for reading and group activities. There will also be a
26 large classroom, a kitchenette, bathrooms and accessory space. Curtis asked if the
27 mechanicals would be exposed on the second floor southern exposure. Demerest stated that
28 they needed to be outside with plenty of air circulation to dissipate heat. Curtis noted that
29 some similar buildings in the Village had built in slat screening to soften the appearance of
30 such mechanicals. Demerest stated that they would consider something similar for this
31 project. In response to another question Demerest stated that the new stairway will primarily
32 provide egress from the new space, but could also provide additional access on special
33 occasions. Demerest stated that originally they were planning to use a metal foam sandwich
34 panel for the exterior siding material similar to that used elsewhere on the building, but they
35 are not entirely happy with the appearance of that material and are looking at other
36 alternatives.

37
38 Referring to the site plan, Demerest noted that they would be adding little if any impervious
39 surface to what was already there. He went on to explain the parking calculations using the
40 Village zoning requirement of 1 space per 200 sf of gross area, whereby 252 spaces would be
41 required. Only the 192 existing spaces are shown, however, which they believe will be
42 sufficient for the expected level of activity, and they are requesting that the Planning Board
43 approve the 25.6% reduction in required parking pursuant to Section 145-55 of the Zoning

1 Law. He noted that the site plan showed the land set aside for the additional parking, as
2 required by Section 145-55, should it be needed sometime in the future.

3
4 Hickey asked Grennell to explain the concept behind the wellness center. Grennell responded
5 that more and more members were expressing an interest in pursuing healthier life styles
6 beyond just physically working out, and the YMCA was responding to this interest. It is part
7 of a national trend toward better nutrition, whole health evaluation and targeted programs for
8 particular needs. They would like to be able to respond to doctor referrals for such particular
9 health needs with on site counseling and program design. The classroom will permit better
10 group training opportunities for people with similar needs and goals. Based on national
11 trends, they anticipate that 65% of their new members will be health seekers and they need to
12 be prepared to respond to the needs of this group. It is part of a nationwide YMCA program
13 called Activate America which has attracted federal attention as a model for addressing
14 America's health needs. Tomei asked if the new space would be rented out for community or
15 private activities. Grennell responded that they did not lease their space for other than
16 YMCA core programs. It is a membership driven organization. They might have a doctor or
17 some other private individual come in and speak about a specific issue, but that would be
18 related to the organization's basic core programs.

19
20 Returning to the parking issue, Gennell explained a handout he had included in the packet
21 material. In it he had tracked the number of members and the number of parking spaces used
22 at various times during any day from the time they opened until when they closed. He noted
23 that most of their members were part of family units so that when they came to the YMCA,
24 there were often more than one member in a car. There are 2600 member units representing
25 around 4700 actual members. 60 school age children are dropped off daily by 8 buses
26 between 2:30 and 3:00PM week days and are picked up by parents between 4:00 and
27 6:00PM. Very few people stay more than 2 hours, so the YMCA is turning over members 6
28 or 7 times a day. There has never been overflow parking since 1982; there has always been
29 adequate parking. Health seekers show up in January and decline by late March either as
30 New Years resolutions wear off or golf courses begin to open. Hickey noted that at the peak
31 time there were 166 members on site so that if each came alone in a car 166 spaces would be
32 required and the YMCA currently has 192 spaces, more than enough to meet their needs.

33
34 Hickey opened the Public Hearing. Curtis asked Grennell for proof of mailing. Grennell
35 responded that he had mailed the required notices well before the deadline, but would have to
36 go back and see if there was any record of his having done so. Hickey suggested the Board
37 move ahead with the proceedings with the outcome contingent on Grennell providing proof
38 of mailing to Curtis prior to finalization of any determination by the Board.

39
40 Hickey then directed the Board to the following report from Village Engineer Brent Cross:

41
42 **VILLAGE OF LANSING**
43 **ENGINEER'S REPORT**

44
45 **DATE:** January 12, 2009

46
47 **TO:** Planning Board

1
2 **FROM:** Brent A. Cross, Village Engineer

3
4 **RE:** YMCA Addition

5
6 **NOTE:** As required for a Special Permit in the Commercial Low Traffic District, I have
7 reviewed the site plan and inspected the site. I have made the following observations
8 and comments:
9

- 10 1.a. The Site Plan does not have specific dimensions for features such as parking
11 spaces, traffic aisles and driveways. By scale, they all appear to meet the
12 general standards of 9'x18' spaces with 24' wide aisles for two-way traffic.
13 The driveways are existing, and also scale to 24' wide.
14
- 15 1.b. The layout is dictated by the existing improvements. In general, the existing
16 site improvements are adequate, but I have had a concern about the
17 circulation pattern ever since the last addition project. From my personal
18 recollection, they were granted a third curb-cut/driveway based (in part) on
19 my recommendation that the existing two driveways (at the main entrance)
20 be designated as one for IN and one for OUT. This would effectively make
21 the driveways at the main entrance into one IN/OUT and the new north
22 driveway as the second permitted curb-cut. I feel that I missed this detail
23 when it came time to approve the previous project for a Certificate of
24 Occupancy.
25
- 26 1.c. As indicated in the application, various forms of transit services drop off and
27 pick up kids. The existing layout does not address the traffic flow during
28 these periods of time. I suggest that a loading zone be designated at the main
29 entrance to the building, with a pass-thru lane on the "inside" to avoid
30 pedestrians crossing traffic.
31
- 32 2. At the time of the previous project, I don't remember that the north parking
33 area was labeled as asphalt pavement. If it was supposed to be gravel, then
34 the calculations for the Stormwater run-off should be revisited. In any case,
35 even if the Planning Board waives the requirement for the extra parking
36 spaces, the existing Stormwater plan should be reviewed for possible needed
37 modifications if/when the parking would become necessary in the future.
38
- 39 3. No utilities are shown on the plan, but I expect that the existing services are
40 adequate to cover the additional proposed space(s).
41
- 42 4. If the proposed parking were to be built, would there be a requirement for
43 site lighting?
44
- 45 5. Will the new facilities have any impact on solid waste production, and
46 therefore is the existing refuse system adequate?
47

48 With regard to Item 1 b, Cross noted that the current circulation pattern is somewhat
49 hazardous in his opinion because the two driveways for the main parking lot are not marked
50 IN and OUT as was originally intended, and consequently cars use both of them to access

1 and exit the parking lot creating possible conflict between cars moving in opposite directions
2 with no clear delineation of drive lanes. Were one marked IN or ENTER and the other OUT
3 or EXIT, the potential for such conflict would be eliminated. He feels somewhat responsible
4 because he did not catch the problem when signing off on the earlier YMCA addition, but
5 suggests taking this opportunity to do what should have been done at that time. Grennell
6 asked which driveway would be the IN and which the OUT. Cross responded that as you face
7 the property, the one on the left would be the IN and the one on the right would be the OUT.
8 Grennell noted that this would require those parking on the south side of the lot to drive
9 around the flag pole island in front of the entrance in order to exit the lot by the designated
10 driveway. This will increase traffic at the most sensitive area where children are dropped off
11 and picked up. When the YMCA built the earlier addition, he proposed connecting the main
12 parking lot with new auxiliary lot to the north so that cars parked on the north side of the
13 main lot could exit through the north lot rather than drive past the entrance to the building.
14 The Planning Board at that time, however, required that a walk way be installed effectively
15 separating the lots. Grennell noted that the two driveways for the main parking lot have been
16 as they are now since the Y was built in 1982, and when they built the last addition they had
17 simply requested the new lot be connected to the old one. The driveway for the new lot
18 became necessary only because the Planning Board did not want the lots connected. Grennell
19 repeated his concern that anything that increases traffic and congestion at the drop-off and
20 pick-up point in front of the Y will make the situation more hazardous. Cross suggested that
21 separating the north and south sides of the main parking lot so that no traffic passed in front
22 of the Y entrance might resolve the problem. Grennell expressed concern that this would
23 make it very difficult for the buses to maneuver around the lot.

24
25 Hickey stated that he was concerned that the Board was being asked to resolve this problem
26 that resulted from an earlier action, and is not really affected by the action currently being
27 considered by the Board. Dubow responded that the Board can always revisit an action for
28 cause upon a new application, if it considers something to be a safety issue. In preparation for
29 the discussion tonight he reviewed the minutes for the meetings where the last addition was
30 approved. At those meetings, Cross did suggest that the main driveways be designated one
31 for IN and the other for OUT. The Board did require that the new lot be separated from the
32 existing lot and cited that as justification for permitting three curb cuts. The conditions of
33 final approval, however, are silent with regard to designating the main driveways IN and
34 OUT. Cross still feels this is a hazardous situation. Grennell noted that he can not recall there
35 ever having been an accident associated with this issue nor any complaints other than Cross'.
36 Hickey suggested that the Board might consider connecting the north lot and the north side of
37 the main lot and then limit or prohibit traffic crossing in front of the Y, using either signage
38 or striping or both. Grennell is concerned that this will complicate drop-off and pick-up and
39 potentially create unintended safety issues.

40
41 Continuing with his report, Cross noted that the stormwater impact should be confirmed by
42 the YMCA's engineer, taking into account that the north parking lot was never paved and
43 also anticipating that the day may come when the Y will need to provide the additional
44 parking that it is not being required to provide now. With regard to utilities, Demerest
45 confirmed that the existing utilities were sufficient and that no change would be required.
46 Cross noted that the site lighting now is marginal and suggested that the Board consider

1 evaluating the lighting and possibly requiring more lighting distributed throughout the
2 parking lots. Dankert will take the light meter to the site and take some readings for
3 consideration by the Lighting Commission. With regard to the dumpsters, Grennell
4 confirmed that there was screening, provided by the Boy Scouts as a public service project.
5

6 Hickey asked if there was anyone present who wished to comment. There being no one who
7 wished to speak, Stycos moved to close the public hearing, seconded by Klepack, all in
8 favor.
9

10 Hickey stated that the Board would move on to the environmental review. Dubow responded
11 that he and Curtis had discussed the SEQRA classification of this action and determined that
12 it was a Type II Exempt action as it is an expansion of a primary nonresidential facility
13 involving less than 4000 square feet and not involving a change in zoning or a use variance.
14 Dubow noted that in the course of their normal deliberations as to Special Permit approval
15 the Board would still discuss environmental issues such as drainage, parking and traffic.
16 Hickey concurred and stated the Board would consider the General Conditions required for
17 all Special Permits under Section 145-59e of the Village of Lansing Code. Hickey read
18 through the ten conditions, noting with regard to Item 4 regarding off-street parking and
19 traffic safety, that the Board would require that Grennell review the parking lot circulation
20 issues discussed earlier and develop a plan to address any deficiencies. The issues of
21 drainage and lighting could likewise be included as conditions of approval. Cross stated that
22 in his professional opinion the lighting in the YMCA parking lots seems inadequate and the
23 Lighting Commission should take a look at it. Dubow suggested that Cross advise the
24 Lighting Commission with regard to technical issues. Cross stated that the light meter should
25 read at least one footcandle anywhere in the parking lots. Dankert will check with
26 Superintendent of Public Works, John Courtney and arrange to check the lighting levels in
27 the lots. Dubow also noted that the Planning Board would need to specifically grant the
28 25.6% parking reduction requested by the YMCA, if that is what it wanted to do. Klepack
29 moved to grant the 25.6% parking reduction pursuant to Section 145-55 of the Village of
30 Lansing Code, seconded by Dankert, all in favor. Tomei moved that, subject to the conditions
31 to be attached to approval, the action met the General Conditions required for all Special
32 Permits. Curtis reviewed the conditions discussed thus far which addressed the issues of
33 stormwater drainage, parking lot lighting and traffic circulation in the parking lots. Klepack
34 seconded the motion, all in favor.
35

36 The Board discussed the conditions of approval and Klepack moved the following resolution,
37 seconded by Stycos:
38

39 VILLAGE OF LANSING PLANNING BOARD RESOLUTION FOR SPECIAL PERMIT
40 APPROVAL ADOPTED ON JANUARY 12, 2009
41

42 **WHEREAS:**
43

- 44 A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Special
45 Permit 2344, YMCA, to construct a 3300 square foot addition to their existing
46 building at 20 Graham Road West in the Commercial Low Traffic District, Tax
47 Parcel No. 47.1-1-17.9. The addition consists primarily of an expansion of the

1 second floor within the existing footprint of the building along with a 300 square
2 foot entryway enhancement; and
3

4 B. The Village of Lansing Zoning and Code Enforcement Officer, in accordance
5 with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State
6 Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQR”), and 6 NYCRR Section 617.5, has
7 advised the Village of Lansing Planning Board that the approval of the proposed
8 special permit is a Type II action, constituting under subsection “c (7)” of said 6
9 NYCRR Section 617.5 “construction or expansion of a primary or
10 accessory/appurtenant, non-residential structure or facility involving less than
11 4000 square feet of gross floor area and not involving a change in zoning or a use
12 variance and consistent with local land use controls, but not radio communication
13 or microwave transmission facilities,” and thus may be processed without further
14 regard to SEQR; and
15

16 C. On January 12, 2009, the Village of Lansing Planning Board held a public hearing
17 regarding this proposed action, and thereafter thoroughly reviewed and analyzed
18 (i) the materials and information presented by and on behalf of the applicant in
19 support of this proposed action, including information and materials related to the
20 environmental issues, if any, which the Board deemed necessary or appropriate
21 for its review, (ii) all other information and materials rightfully before the Board,
22 and (iii) all issues raised during the public hearing and/or otherwise raised in the
23 course of the Board’s deliberations; and
24

25 D. On January 12, 2009, in accordance with Section 725-b of the Village Law of the
26 State of New York and Sections 145-59, 145-60, 145-60.1 and 145-61 of the
27 Village of Lansing Code, the Village of Lansing Planning Board, in the course of
28 its further deliberations, reviewed and took into consideration (i) the general
29 conditions required for all special permits (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-
30 59E), (ii) any applicable conditions required for certain special permit uses
31 (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-60), (iii) any applicable conditions required
32 for uses within a Combining District (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-61),
33 and (iv) any environmental issues deemed necessary and/or appropriate;
34

35 **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:**
36

37 1. The Village of Lansing Planning Board hereby determines that the approval of the
38 proposed special permit is a Type II action, constituting under subsection “c (7)”
39 of said 6 NYCRR Section 617.5 “construction or expansion of a primary or
40 accessory/appurtenant, non-residential structure or facility involving less than
41 4000 square feet of gross floor area and not involving a change in zoning or a use
42 variance and consistent with local land use controls, but not radio communication
43 or microwave transmission facilities,” and thus may be processed without further
44 regard to SEQR; and
45

46 2. The Village of Lansing Planning Board hereby finds (subject to the conditions
47 and requirements, if any, set forth below) that the proposed action meets (i) all

1 general conditions required for all special permits (Village of Lansing Code
2 Section 145-59E), (ii) any applicable conditions required for certain special
3 permit uses (Village of Lansing Code Section 145-60), and (iii) any applicable
4 conditions required for uses within a Combining District (Village of Lansing
5 Code Section 145-61); and
6

7 3. It is hereby determined by the Village of Lansing Planning Board that Special
8 Permit No. 2344 is **GRANTED AND APPROVED**, subject to the following
9 conditions and requirements:
10

- 11 1. **Storm water management analysis approved by the Village Engineer.**
- 12 2. **Approval by the Lighting Commission of site lighting.**
- 13 3. **Traffic circulation plan approved by the Village Engineer.**

14 The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:
15

16
17 **AYES: Ned Hickey, Mario Tomei, Carol Klepack, Maria Stycos and Phil Dankert**
18

19 **NAYS: None**
20

21 The motion was declared to be carried.
22

23 Curtis noted that in addition to the other conditions, Grennell must provide proof of mailing
24 of the supplemental notice or the determination would be void until a properly noticed public
25 hearing could be held.
26

27 **No Parking Zone Designations**

28 Hickey asked Curtis if he would report on the proposed “No Parking” law. Curtis referred the
29 Board to an email from Courtney in the packets in which Courtney estimated the number of
30 signs that would be required to designate the areas discussed by the Planning Board earlier,
31 and the estimated cost of purchasing and installing those signs. Curtis reminded the Board
32 that their recommendation of the proposed law was pending Courtney’s review and these
33 estimates. Courtney estimated 40 signs would be required at a cost of around \$2300. Hickey
34 and Curtis will prepare a recommendation from the Planning Board to the Trustees.
35

36 **Amending Areas of Disturbance in the Bolton Estates Subdivision**

37 Hickey stated that he had been approached by a buyer of one of the lots in the Bolton Estates
38 Subdivision who asked how one could change the area where disturbance was permitted on
39 one of the lots and obtain approval to replace some shrubs with better ones. Hickey
40 anticipates more questions and requests as other lots are sold and would like the Board to
41 discuss the issue now so that it can develop a consistent policy that will apply equally to all
42 such requests. He checked with the Project Engineer, Andy Sciarabba, about how the areas of
43 disturbance were designated. Sciarabba explained that each was 1 ½ acres in size and that
44 was derived based on the stormwater runoff calculation. The gross amount of disturbance can
45 not be increased without affecting those stormwater calculations. Dubow noted that the
46 owner, complying with subdivision final plat approval conditions established by the Planning

1 Board, had filed restrictive covenants limiting development on the parcels as well. The owner
2 can not change the Village's restrictions as noted on the plat and filed therewith at the
3 County Clerk's Office without the Village's agreement, nor can the Village change the
4 owner's restrictive covenants without the owner's consent. The owner may not be willing to
5 amend the disturbance limits in which case the Village has no recourse to do so. Both the
6 owner and the Village must agree to a change in order for that change to be effected.
7 Members were concerned that granting changes would open a can of worms with the other
8 owners wanting changes as well. The intention was to leave the land in its natural state as
9 much as possible. Ned noted that some of the areas like the vegetative buffers along the
10 stream swales were specifically to be left in their natural state. With regard to the less
11 sensitive sites, however, Sciarabba had suggested that changing the type of shrub did not
12 matter as long as the amount of land disturbed did not increase with regard to the stormwater
13 calculations. Curtis noted that the areas of disturbance did not appear to have been laid out
14 with any particular scientific refinement. The Harris' by way of contrast had carefully
15 delineated the disturbance area for their Twin Glens property specifically to save what they
16 considered to be important trees. Dubow noted that the disturbance areas seemed to pretty
17 much follow the front and side yard set backs from the Zoning Law with the rear yard being
18 wherever the acre and a half dictated it must be. The areas were proposed by the developer
19 and the Board simply endorsed those areas as proposed. Any discussion of changing the
20 boundaries must include the developer.

21
22 Curtis stated that there should be more clarity with regard to exactly what activities were
23 being limited. As a construction term, limits of disturbance generally applied to activities like
24 grubbing, excavating and building, and would not normally apply to landscaping, planting,
25 pruning, etc. Dubow noted the language of the covenants referred to development and
26 improvements. Curtis stated that the term "improvement" could be interpreted in many ways
27 and that it would be useful to sit down with the owner and define more precisely what
28 exactly is intended. Outside of the Unique Natural Areas where the Conservation Easement
29 was granted to the Village, much of the land is old fields which are neither particularly
30 attractive nor environmentally sensitive. Dubow noted that in this case the Village was not
31 imposing the limitation, but rather simply endorsing the limitations proposed by the
32 developer. Curtis suggested that interested Board members sit down with Ed Crossmore, the
33 developer, and clearly define what is meant by such terms as "improvement" and
34 "disturbance", and what exactly is permitted and what is not so that when people purchase
35 lots and come to the Village with proposals for development, the Village can respond clearly
36 and consistently. Hickey will contact Sciarabba and set up a meeting with himself, Curtis and
37 one other Board member to go over the Board's concerns so that Sciarabba can secure
38 clarification or some sort of general agreement from Crossmore.

39
40 Tomei asked if the limits of disturbance needed to be one area or could a property owner
41 break the area up into two areas for example. Hickey responded that from a stormwater,
42 quantitative perspective breaking the area up would not be a problem, but from a qualitative
43 perspective in terms of what Crossmore and the Board hoped to accomplish, it might be. That
44 is why it is important to sit down with Sciarabba and/or Crossmore and get some
45 clarification.

1 **Stewardship Program**

2 Klepack had nothing to report. Cross, however, asked the Board to consider a similar
3 program for stormwater management practices. He would like to undertake a survey and
4 inventory of the stormwater practices that the Village, as an MS4, either owns or is otherwise
5 responsible for maintaining. This would ensure that the Village could monitor these practices
6 at least once a year, do any required maintenance and file the necessary reports. If the Board
7 has no objection, he would like to propose this to the Trustees as a budget item. No objection
8 was expressed.

9
10 **Approval of Minutes**

11 Dankert moved to approve the minutes for the November 10 meeting as amended, seconded
12 by Stycos. Klepack, Hickey, Tomei, Dankert and Stycos voted in favor.

13
14 **Reports**

15
16 Hickey reported that the joint meeting with the Trustees and Tom LiVigne and possibly his
17 boss from Cornell Real Estate was now scheduled for February 9. They will discuss work
18 force housing and other issues of shared concern. The Trustees will be joining the Planning
19 Board at the Planning Board's regular meeting on February 9.

20
21 Hickey referred the Board's attention to an article in the packets entitled, *Overhauling Your*
22 *Zoning Code*, noting that, if time permitted over the next several months, it might be timely
23 for the Board to undertake a review and update of the Zoning Law. Curtis responded that it
24 would be a big job, but one that is badly needed to be done. He is constantly running into
25 items in the Zoning Law that are poorly written, no longer applicable or not adequately
26 addressed or not addressed at all. He spoke with Trustee Julie Baker who recently worked
27 with him to develop the revised Building Code Administration Law and she may be
28 interested in helping on a review of the Zoning Law. Hickey added that the article suggested
29 involving stakeholders in the process which might include developers, builders, property
30 owners, business people, etc. to identify parts of the law they find problematic or that might
31 be improved. Stycos reminded the Board that they had also discussed updating the Green
32 Way Plan. This should include indicating on a map which trails have been built and which
33 are just proposed and will eventually, tying in with the Stewardship Program, result in
34 surveying and marking trails that are otherwise difficult to find.

35
36 **Adjournment:**

37 Klepack moved to adjourn at 9:35 P.M. Seconded by Tomei. Ayes by Hickey, Dankert,
38 Klepack, Stycos and Tomei. Motion carried.