Village of Lansing Planning Board Meeting February 13, 2012

- The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:32 P.M. by Chairman
 Mario Tomei.
 Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Maria Stycos, Lisa Schleelein, and Phi
 - Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Maria Stycos, Lisa Schleelein, and Phil Dankert; Alternate Member Jon Kanter; Code Enforcement Officer Marty Moseley; Village Attorney David Dubow; Community Party Observer Gerry Monaghan.
 - Tomei appointed Kanter as an acting member for the meeting due to the absence of Planning Board member Richard Durst.

Public Comment Period

Tomei opened the public comment period.

Monaghan noted that he was concerned with the Shops at Ithaca Mall being out of compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for the exterior sidewalks and connectivity. Monaghan also has contacted and had a discussion with Pat Pryor the Tompkins County representative for Lansing. Monaghan added that there are a number of places that would be an obstacle for a person that is in a wheelchair in order for that person to travel from the Beckett Way trail to Triphammer Road. Monaghan also noted that there is no connectivity to the new BJ's club and that the sidewalk in between the YMCA and Target usually has obstructions on it, like rocks. Monaghan noted that he has a good friend that is in a wheelchair that does have a hard time traversing to the mall because of these issues. Monaghan stated that even if the situation could not be fully compliant, it could be partially compliant. Monaghan also noted that the Village will probably be under scrutiny because the Beckett Way trail does not comply with the ADA standards.

Moseley indicated that the Village does require, when the opportunity arises, an individual or a business to increase the walkability of the community. Moseley added that the Developer for the BJ's project has an obligation to install a sidewalk, among other obligations, from the Target vicinity that would connect to the new BJ's club. This was not installed in 2011 due to the developer running out of time before the winter months. Moseley noted that they are also required to install a sidewalk that would connect from Oakcrest Road to the Hickory Hollow Road and that would eventually connect to the existing sidewalk in front of the YMCA. Moseley indicated that he would contact the Mall to discuss the issue with obstructions on the current sidewalk in between the Target store and the YMCA.

Leopold noted that there has been a long standing issue, which the Village continues to work on, with accessibility on Pyramid Drive and Graham Road West. Part of the issue is that the Village does not actually own the land in certain areas to be able to fix or install a continuous sidewalk.

Monaghan noted that he just wanted to inform the Village of his concern.

With no one else wishing to speak, Stycos moved to close the public comment period. Seconded by Dankert; Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein, and Kanter.

Planned Sign Area (PSA) Amendment: Tops outparcel building proposed increase to Applebee's 37 allowed signage. 38 Tomei gave an explanation on how the Planning Board has now found itself at this point (please 39 refer to the Planning Board minutes of 12-12-11 and 1-9-12 for an explanation). Tomei added that the 40 41 purpose is to be slightly more flexible on what is considered a sign but still retain a certain amount of control. Tomei referred to the document that was provided in the Planning Board meeting of 1-9-12 titled: 42 Proposed Sign Law Amendments. Tomei noted that within that specific document it allows the Zoning 43 Officer to determine if an awning were to be a sign, and if it would be considered a sign the matter would 44 then be referred to the Planning board to work through the newly proposed process. Tomei asked if the 45 Board thought that the Applebee's should be allotted additional square footage of sign area. 46 47 Dubow reminded the Board that this would be an amendment, to the Sign Law, that would be 48 allowed in the entire Village if approved by the Trustees. Dubow added that the Applebee's restaurant 49 still has the issue of asking for additional square footage of sign area be added to their PSA. 50 Leopold noted that if one tenant asked for and was approved to have a larger sign area, then the 51 other tenants in the Tops outparcel building might make the same requests. 52 Dubow noted that there are two levels of recommendations that the Planning Board could make. 53 Schleelein noted that if the Planning Board recommended the increased sign area for Applebee's 54 it would only be for one red apple on a green awning, which would increase the sign area by 55 approximately 24 square feet. 56 Kanter noted that the appealing idea with the PSA's is that for a change to be made the applicant is required to work with the Planning Board instead of the Board of Zoning Appeals, which also allows 57 for more discretion. 58 59 Dubow agreed with Kanter's comment. Dubow asked to what extent the sign area would increase with the proposed red apple on the 60 61 awning. Moseley indicated that it would almost double the area. 62 63 Schleelein asked if only the pictorial image would be considered the additional signage. Schleelein asked if the Applebee's restaurant was larger than the other tenants. 64 65 Moseley indicated that he agreed with both comments, but that the original PSA was laid out to allow for a maximum of 25 square feet per tenant no matter the size of the tenant. 66 Dubow noted that the amendment could reflect that the larger tenants, based on total square 67 68 footage, would be allowed more sign area within the PSA. Dubow added that originally there were four 69 total stores with 25 square foot of sign area each, but now there are 7 tenants with 25 square feet of

70

signage per tenant.

Leopold reminded the Board that Mathnasium asked for a larger sign but was denied and was required to conform to the PSA requirements.

Kanter indicated that he would not support an increase to the Applebee's restaurant signage. Kanter noted that they would be able to install awnings with pictorial images on them as long as they did not exceedingly contrast with the awning color, and he was concerned about other tenants wanting larger sign areas if Applebee's was granted a larger sign area. Kanter noted that the wording was arranged in such a way that allowed an awning sign, if deemed a sign by the Zoning Officer, to be approved by the Planning Board regardless of the size of the sign and as long as all the steps were followed in the proposed sign amendment language.

Tomei suggested to make the sign law amendment recommendation to the Trustees and wait to see if Applebee's re-submits for additional awnings with contrasting pictorial images. Moved by Dankert. Seconded by Kanter; Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein, and Kanter.

<u>Planned Sign Area (PSA) Amendment:</u> Cayuga Mall proposed increase to Sumo Japanese Hibachi Sushi restaurant allowed signage.

Tomei gave an explanation on how the Planning Board has found itself at this point (please refer to the Planning Board minutes of 12-12-11 and 1-9-12 for an explanation). Tomei noted that if the Sumo Japanese restaurant frontage was any longer it would be allowed to have a 40 square foot sign. Tomei added that the proposed sign will also be located next to a much larger sign as well (TJ Maxx).

Schleelein noted that the Builders Best store does have a smaller sign that would be right next to the restaurant.

Tomei suggested that the restaurant be allowed to increase their sign to a maximum size of 45 square feet due to the location. Tomei added that even if the rest of the stores were to increase their signs as well it would not visually impact the area due to the position of the mall and the difficulty in being able to see the existing signs on the stores.

Dubow asked if the calculation method, for calculating the allowable sign area per store, would need to be amended.

Kanter suggested that the sign calculation method stay the same but allow for the smaller stores to increase their total sign area with a not-to-exceed per tenant sign area. Kanter added that this would act as something like a hardship credit.

Leopold asked how the Triphammer Mall PSA worked and if the entire area of the sign incorporated unused area on the overall piece of plastic.

Dubow indicated that he thought that the sign area was the entire area even if there was unused area for wording and that PSA required the signs to all have a yellow background with a specific color of lettering.

106 Moseley indicated that he would have to look at the PSA document to answer Leopold's questions. 107 108 Dubow noted that the bank idea for the Cayuga Mall PSA could be for unique situations with a not-to-exceed size, which then would allow the mall to delegate, to a certain extent, the size of the sign 109 110 per tenant. Schleelein asked if a pylon were to be installed would it be considered part of their PSA. 111 Moseley indicated that it would be, but it would also be separated to identify what would be 112 113 allowed as a maximum sign area for the pylon. Dankert asked if Monroe Muffler, Pizza Hut, and the Econolodge were all considered part of the 114 115 PSA. Moseley indicated that Dankert was correct. 116 117 Leopold liked the idea of the signage bank for the smaller tenants. Stycos suggested allowing the Sumo restaurant to have maximum 45 square foot sign due to the 118 small size of the restaurant and the distance away from the main roads. 119 Tomei suggested waiting until the mall would like to remodel the façade to determine how to 120 exactly amend the Cayuga Mall PSA. 121 122 Schleelein moved to recommend to the Trustees to allow the Sumo Japanese restaurant to increase the size of the sign to 45 square feet, due to the substantial improvements to the tenant space and 123 other items that have been explained in the above related section. Seconded by Stycos; Ayes: Tomei, 124 Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein, and Kanter. 125 Zoning Amendments for Special Permit procedures and Commercial Low Traffic (CLT) 126 127 Clarifications. Tomei read the proposed amendments for an existing special permit, which reads: 128 129 145-59. Special Permits. 130 131 A. Intent. The legislative intent of this section is to set forth regulations, procedures and conditions 132 which apply to certain permitted uses which are sufficiently unique in terms of their nature, 133 134 location and effect on the surrounding environment and the quality of the community to warrant special evaluation of each individual case. 135 Applicability. [Amended 6-5-1995 by L.L. No. 5-1995¹] 136 В. 137 A Special Permit is required for all uses designated as permitted with Special Permit in §§ 145-36 through 145-50, all uses occurring in the Human Health Services, Flood Hazard, 138 Conservation and Farm and Craft Market Combining Districts, set forth in §§ 145-46, 145-139

¹Editor's Note: Amended at time of adoption of Code; see Ch. 1, General Provisions, Art. I.

- 47, 145-48, 145-49 and 145-50. Such uses are not permitted until all applicable general, additional and special conditions required have been complied with and a Special Permit has been authorized by the Planning Board.
- (2) The Planning Board shall have review and decision authority over all Special Permits for which authority is not expressly reserved to the Board of Trustees.

C. Exemptions. [Amended 4-17-1990 by L.L. No. 7-1990]

The following shall be exempt from the requirements for Special Permit:

- (1) Any change in uses which does not involve any new structure or building or addition thereto, nor any structural alterations that could result in a substantial change to the exterior appearance and/or aesthetic characteristics of an existing building.
- (2) Any minor alteration to the facade of a proposed or existing building (e.g., the elimination of an exterior window or door) which does not result in an increase in the gross floor area square footage of such building, provided that all construction associated with such minor alteration conforms to the requirements of this chapter and all applicable Building and Fire Codes.
- D. Special Permit procedures.
 - (1) Issuance of Special Permit. Within their respective jurisdictions, and following proper review procedures and an approval, the Planning Board and the Board of Trustees may authorize the Zoning Officer to issue a Special Permit.
 - (2) Submission date of application. Every application for a Special Permit, complete and accompanied by the required fee (see § 145-57D) and all materials and data required by this chapter (see § 145-57C) shall be filed with the Village Clerk at least twelve (12) days prior to the regular monthly business meeting of the Board to which such application must be submitted as provided in this § 145-59.
 - (3) Notice of public hearing. [Amended 6-5-1995 by L.L. No. 5-1995]
 - (a) For those uses over which it has either sole or preliminary review authority, the Planning Board shall conduct a public hearing, within sixty-two (62) days from the day that the Village has received a completed application for a Special Permit, at which the Special Permit will be reviewed and must publish and post notice in at least three (3) prominent places at least five (5) days prior to the hearing, stating the nature of the request and the time and place of the hearing.
 - (b) The Planning Board shall attempt to provide to the Board of Trustees, at least five (5) days prior, written notice of any public hearing of the Planning Board at which a Special Permit request will be reviewed. Such notice shall be delivered to the Village Clerk and shall state the nature of each Special Permit request to be reviewed and the time and place of the hearing. The giving of such notice to the Board of Trustees shall not constitute a requirement of this section and the failure to give or receive such notice shall not affect the validity or binding authority of any action, recommendation or decision made by the Planning Board pursuant to its authority under this section.
 - (a) In the case of any Special Permit application for which the Board of Trustees has sole authority for review, the Board of Trustees shall conduct a public hearing, within sixty-two (62) days from the day that the Village has received a completed application for a Special Permit, and all other requirements of this § 145-59 concerning review of such Special Permit shall apply to the Board of Trustees' review of such application in the same manner as such requirements would otherwise apply to the Planning Board's review of a Special Permit application hereunder. [Amended 12-18-1995 by L.L. No. 7-1995]
 - (4) Supplementary notice. [Amended 3-5-1986 by L.L. No. 2-1986]

199 200 201

202

198

208 209 210

207

211 212

213

219 220 221

222

218

223 224 225

226 227

228

233 234

- (a) It is the intent of this subsection to provide a supplementary means of notification to residents of the Village concerning Planning Board actions that may be of community interest. The means of notification described below are considered additional to the primary means of notification, posting and publishing in the newspaper. The Village bears no responsibility to ensure that the supplementary means of notification are received by the residents.
- (b) Events requiring supplementary notification:
 - The application for a Special Permit to build on or change the use of a [1] previously vacant parcel.
 - A proposal to change the use of land or an existing building from residential to [2] either a commercial or business and technological use, or from a commercial to a business and technological use.
 - The application for a Special Permit for a one-unit residence converted (see § [3] 145-60A).
- (c) Method of supplementary notification. The applicant shall send written notice by mail to all owners of Village property contiguous to the boundaries of the property under consideration. Such notice shall state the nature of the request, the time and place of the public hearing and such additional information as shall be required by the Village Zoning Officer. Such notice shall be mailed no less than five (5) days prior to the public hearing. Proof of such mailing shall be filed with the Board hearing such application prior to the holding of the public hearing. [Amended 6-5-1995 by L.L. No. 5-1995]
- (5) Planning Board review and referral. [Amended 8-1-1994 by L.L. No. 4-1994; 6-5-1995 by L.L. No. 5-1995]
 - (a) In the case of a Special Permit application for which the Planning Board is required to provide a recommendation to the Board of Trustees, the Planning Board shall render such recommendation within thirty-two (32) days following the later of the completion of the application or the close of any public hearing conducted by the Planning Board in connection with said application. The Planning Board's recommendation to the Board of Trustees shall be in writing.
 - (b) At least ten (10) days prior to the public hearing to be conducted in connection with the Special Permit application, the Board authorized to conduct such hearing shall mail notices thereof to the applicant and to the Tompkins County Planning Department, as required by § 239-m of the General Municipal Law, which notice shall be accompanied by a full statement of the matter under consideration, as defined in accordance with § 239-m.
- (6)Mandatory review of approved Special Permits. If more than three (3) years have elapsed between the date that the Planning Board approves the issuance of a Special Permit/building permit and the date that the applicant satisfies the conditions for the issuance of the Special Permit/building permit, the Code Enforcement Officer may not issue that Special Permit/building permit until the Planning Board has reviewed that Special Permit/building permit and reaffirmed its approval with any additional conditions or modifications to existing conditions that may be required by changes in circumstances. [Added 8-1-1994 by L.L. No. 4-19941
- Decisions on Special Permit applications. The Board authorized to decide upon (i) a Special Permit application or (ii) an application to amend a previously approved Special Permit shall do so within sixty-two (62) days after the close of the required public hearing; provided, however, that in the case of a "minor" amendment to a previously approved Special Permit for which a public hearing is not required (in accordance with §145-59 F

249

250

- 251 252 253 254 255 256
- 258 259 260 261 262

257

268

263

- 269 270 271 272 273
- 274 275 276 277 278
- 280 281 282

283

284

- below), the Board authorized to decide upon such matter shall do so within sixty-two (62) days after the Board meeting at which the Board commenced its review of the proposed Special Permit amendment. The time within which the authorized Board must render its decision may be extended by mutual consent of the applicant and the authorized Board. The decision of the authorized Board on the Special Permit application shall be filed in the office of the Village Clerk within five (5) business days after the day such decision is rendered, and a copy thereof mailed to the applicant at that time. The decision shall be deemed to have been rendered as of the date that the final vote has been taken by the authorized Board on the Special Permit application. [Added 6-5-1995 by L.L. No. 5-1995]
- Area variance required. In the event that a Special Permit application contains one (1) or (8) more features that do not comply with applicable provisions of this chapter, the applicant may apply to the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals for an area variance, in accordance with the terms of § 145-72 of this chapter, without the necessity of a decision or determination of any administrative official charged with the enforcement of the requirements of this Chapter 145 as the basis for such area variance application. [Added 6-5-1995 by L.L. No. 5-1995]
- (9) Conditions to Special Permits. The Board authorized to decide upon a Special Permit application shall have the authority to impose such reasonable conditions and restrictions as are directly related to and incidental to the proposed Special Permit. Upon the granting of the Special Permit, any such conditions must be met by the applicant, or the applicant's successors in interest, and, in the event that the applicant, or the applicant's successors, fail to meet any such condition of the Special Permit, the Village Code Enforcement Officer shall withhold any building or Similar Permit that would otherwise be issued in connection with or as a result of the granting of the Special Permit until such time as the Code Enforcement Officer has verified compliance with all such conditions. [Added 6-5-1995 by L.L. No. 5-1995]
- (10) Waiver of conditions. The Board authorized to decide upon the Special Permit application may, when reasonable, waive any pre-established requirements for the approval, approval with conditions or disapproval of the Special Permit application. Any such waiver may be subject to such appropriate conditions as the authorized Board may impose, in accordance with § 145-60 below. Any such waiver may be exercised in the event that the requirements to be waived are found not to be requisite in the interest of the public health, safety or general welfare, or are found to be inappropriate to a particular Special Permit. [Added 6-5-1995 by L.L. No. 5-1995]
- E. General conditions required for all Special Permits. The Planning Board and the Board of Trustees within their respective jurisdiction may require specific measures that must be taken to implement these general conditions, Both Boards may require performance standards higher than the minimum specified in this chapter (§ 145-83) if the potential adverse impact on the neighborhood warrants it. In those instances where the Planning Board recommends action to the Board of Trustees, such recommendation shall include a note of necessary modification to performance standards. No Special Permit will be granted by the Planning Board or the Board of Trustees unless the requested activity meets the following requirements.
 - It will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare. (1)
 - It will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the vicinity or (2) neighborhood.

- 285 286 287
- vicinity or neighborhood.
- 288 289
- 290
- 291
- 292 293
- 294 295 296
- 297 298 299

303 304 305

306

307

313 314 315

312

332 333

- (3) It will not impede the orderly development of the vicinity or neighborhood and is appropriate in appearance and in harmony with the existing or intended character of the
- (4) The street system and off-street parking facilities can handle the expected traffic in a safe and efficient manner.
- Natural surface water drainageways are not adversely affected. (5)
- Water and sewerage or waste disposal facilities are adequate. (6)
- The general environmental quality of the proposal, in terms of site planning, architectural (7) design and landscaping, is compatible with the character of the neighborhood.
- Lot area, access, parking and loading facilities are sufficient for the proposed use. (8)
- (9) The requested use or facility conforms in all other respects to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located.
- The applicant has shown that steps will be taken where necessary to meet all performance standards and all other applicable general regulations.

F. Amendments to Previously Approved Special Permits.

The following provisions shall govern the approval of amendments to a previously approved Special Permit (excepting amendments to a previously approved Special Permit for a Telecommunications Facility for which such amendments shall be governed by § 145-60 K.)

- No amendment(s) to a previously approved Special Permit shall be made unless and until **(1)** (i) the party seeking such amendment(s) submits an application therefor setting forth information and materials regarding such proposed amendment satisfactory to the Village Code and Zoning Officer, together with a fee in an amount consistent with the applicable required fee for a building/land use or Special Permit as set forth in §145-57 D above; and (ii) the Planning Board or the Board of Trustees (whichever Board shall be responsible for approval of such Special Permit) has approved such amendment(s) as provided for in subsection F(2) below.
- *(*2*)* Upon the Village Code and Zoning Officer having received a complete and satisfactory application for the proposed amendment(s) to a previously approved Special Permit as provided for above, and upon its referral to the Planning Board or the Board of Trustees (whichever Board shall be responsible for approval of such Special Permit), the applicable Board shall make an initial determination as to whether such proposed amendment(s) is/are deemed to be "minor" or "major". Such determinations shall be made in the sole discretion of the applicable Board. Except as may otherwise be provided in this subsection F, (i) if the proposed amendment(s) is/are determined to be a "major", approval thereof shall be in accordance with all Special Permit provisions and procedures set forth in § 145-57 and this § 145-59, and, if applicable, referral of the proposed amendment(s) to the Tompkins County Planning Department and neighboring municipalities in accordance with General Municipal Law Sections 239 -l, -m and -nn will be required; and (ii) if the proposed amendment(s) is/are determined to be "minor", approval thereof shall be in accordance with all Special Permit provisions and procedures set forth in § 145-57 and all provisions and procedures set forth in this §145-59 except for subsections 145-59 D(3), 145-59 D(4), and 145-D(5)(b), and referral of the proposed amendment(s) to the Tompkins County Planning Department and neighboring municipalities in accordance with General Municipal Law Sections 239 -l, -m and -nn will not be required.

Dubow noted that currently there is no tool in the zoning that would allow for a change to an existing special permit unless all the procedures were followed again. This allows the applicant, if determined to be a minor change, to alter the permit in a friendlier manner. Dubow noted that this process would also be similar to other areas in the code.

Kanter asked if Tompkins County Planning Department would approve not revising their review of a project if it were to be classified as a minor change to an existing permit.

Upon further discussion from the Planning Board, Moseley would contact the Tompkins County Planning Department to see if the intermunicipal agreement between the County Planning Department and the Village could be amended so that the County Planning Department would not be required to review a minor change to an existing special permit.

Dankert moved to recommend the proposed changes to the Trustees pending confirmation that the Tompkins County Planning Department would agree to exempt the re-review of a minor change to an existing special permit. Seconded by Kanter; Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein, and Kanter.

Tomei noted that the second proposed change would read as:

145-42. Commercial Low Traffic District (CLT).

- A. Intent. The legislative intent of this section is to define and establish standard regulations for the Village where service facilities are the desired land use; where public utilities to serve such facilities are available; and where areas that border on residential areas or do not have an adequate road system to handle large volumes of vehicular traffic are reserved for low traffic uses, thereby preserving the residential environment of the surrounding areas. The further intent of this subsection is to define and establish permitted uses with respect to which traffic generation, site design and architectural design are consistent with (I) the other permitted uses in this district and (ii) all applicable standards and design guidelines, it being understood that all improvement should conform with the applicable CLT District Design Guidelines (to which Guidelines all applicants for permits and approvals are directed. [Added 9-10-2003 by L.L. No. 3-2003]
- B. Permitted uses. Permitted uses shall be as follows:
 - (1) Utility service underground.
 - (2) Natural parks.
 - (3) One-unit residential building.
 - (4) Two-unit residential building.
- (5) Multiunit residential building.
 - (6) Alteration to Building or Improved Site <u>with no</u> Change in Use <u>and no</u> Change in Applicable Parking Space Requirements [Added 10-16-2000 by L.L. No. 5-2000]
 - (7) Temporary Non-Commercial Activities [Added 10-17-2011 by L.L. No. 7-2011]

370 371	C.	Permitted uses with additional conditions. Uses permitted with additional conditions shall be as follows: [Amended 3-1-1999 by L.L. No. 3-1999]
372		(1) Alteration to building or improved site.
373		(2) Temporary commercial activities.
374	D.	Permitted with Special Permit. Uses permitted with a Special Permit shall be as follows:
375		(1) General conditions.
376		(a) Utility transmission/storage/plants.
377		(b) Religious facility.
378		(c) Schools.
379		(d) Group residential building.
380		(e) Outdoor recreation/club.
381		(f) Indoor recreation/club.
382		(g) Office/studio/service.
383		(h) Government buildings.
384		(i) Museums/public buildings.
385		(j) Undertaking.
386		(k) Hospital/clinic.
387		(l) Construction sales/storage.
388 389		(m) Alteration to Building or improved Site that Results in <i>a Change in Use or a</i> Change
390		in Applicable Parking Space Requirements [Added 10-16-00 by L.L. No. 5-2000]
391		
392		(n) Low Traffic Food and Beverage [Added 9-10-2003 by
393		L.L. No. 3-2003]
394		(o) Low Impact Technology [Added 9-10-2003 by L.L. No. 3-2003]
395		
396 397		Kanter moved to recommend the proposed changes to the Trustees. Seconded by Stycos; Ayes: Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein, and Kanter.
398	i oiliei, i	Dankert, Stycos, Schiedich, and Kanter.
330		

399	Approval of Minutes		
400	None		
401	<u>Reports</u>		
402 403	Trustees- Please refer to the minutes of the Trustees February6 th meeting for a full report.		
404	Other Business		
405	Tomei explained that voting will conflict with the April 24 th Planning Board meeting. Tomei		
406	added that the meeting will either need to be rescheduled or canceled.		
407	Kanter noted that the annual New York Planning Federation conference will now be scheduled		
408	for April instead of the traditional October date. Kanter added that the notice of the draft development		
409	area strategy from Tomkins County is now on their website and looks to be interesting. Kanter noted that		
410	the study has been worked on for over a year where the County is identifying desirable areas with in		
411	Tompkins County where future growth could occur.		
412	<u>Adjournment</u>		
413	Schleelein moved to adjourn at 8:50PM. Seconded by Stycos; Ayes: Tomei, Dankert, Stycos, Schleelein		
414	and Kanter.		
415			