

**Village of Lansing
Planning Board Meeting
December 10, 2012**

1 The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:35 P.M. by Chairman
2 Mario Tomei.

3 Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members, Phil Dankert, Lisa Schleelein, and Maria
4 Stycos; Alternate Member Jon Kanter; Code Enforcement Officer Marty Moseley; Village Attorney
5 David Dubow; Trustee Liaison Julie Baker; and Community Observer Stu Grinnell.

6 Tomei appointed Kanter as an acting member for the meeting due to the absence of Planning
7 Board member Richard Durst.

8 **Public Comment Period**

9 Tomei opened the public comment period.

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

12 **Village Lansing Place Planned Sign Area (PSA) Discussion**

13 Tomei noted that the Village Lansing Place (VLP) property already does have an existing pylon
14 sign, but the sign does not include the names of the individual tenants. Tomei added that there are existing
15 signs on the VLP building that are not being used at this time.

16 Moseley handed out the existing PSA document for the VLP for reference.

17 Dankert asked what the dimensions were of the new sign.

18 Schleelein noted that each current tenant appears to get an 8½ by 66” sign slot on the proposed
19 pylon. Schleelein indicated that it is possible that additional tenants would like to be added to the Pylon
20 sign if they moved into the mall.

21 Tomei noted that if amended, the pylon sign area would be a maximum size and would need to be
22 divided up according to the landlord. Tomei added that the 27”x72” additional wooden sign proposed for
23 the top of the pylon sign would be unlit. Tomei added that he was not sure of the hours of illumination
24 for the existing pylon.

25 Moseley indicated that the pylon is not illuminated this evening and he could not remember the
26 last time he saw the pylon illuminated.

27 Schleelein noted that she was slightly concerned with potential light trespass from the sign onto
28 the neighboring hotel property. Schleelein noted that she was not aware that this mall had an official
29 name.

30 Kanter noted that the intent of the change would be because the individual tenants need to have
31 more identification than what already exists. Kanter asked, besides Subway, why would the other
32 businesses need more identification since most of those businesses are not the typical tenant that one

33 would think would need more identification. Kanter added that the tenants in this particular mall are not
34 the typical mall tenant and don't seem to need to draw in customers with extra signage.

35 Schleelein noted that she did not know who the tenants of the mall were until she investigated
36 what businesses or tenants existed in the VLP.

37 Stycos explained that, in the past, tenants had expressed concern over the lack of visibility to
38 draw in business. Stycos added that the VLP mall tenants can be seen from McDonalds, but not from
39 North Triphammer Road.

40 Dankert noted that most of the other malls in the area already have or will have a main pylon of
41 their independent tenants, and feels that it might not be appropriate to deny the current VLP request to
42 change and enlarge their pylon.

43 Kanter noted that the west side of the building could use some improvement.

44 Dubow read a letter, dated 1995, from the Planning Board Chairman to the Mayor explaining the
45 PSA increase and possible need for aesthetic improvements in the future if changes were requested of the
46 PSA for the VLP.

47 Kanter asked where the VLP stands with their current PSA and the incorporation of the requested
48 additional sign area.

49 Moseley noted that the proposed additional sign area is approximately 13.5 square feet total.

50 Tomei asked if there was any additional sign area for the VLP available.

51 Moseley indicated that the best he can determine, most of the existing signs are approximately
52 22-23 square feet. Moseley added that there are currently 11 signs on the VLP building, and at 23 square
53 feet that would be approximately 301 square feet with the pylon sign accounted for. Moseley noted that
54 the VLP signs do have the option to be increased as long as they did not exceed the 550 square feet that
55 was originally allotted in the 1995 PSA document.

56 Dubow noted that, according to the PSA document, the 550 square feet is inclusive of the main
57 pylon sign. Dubow added that the provisions in the Village Sign Law indicate that the Zoning Officer can
58 approve signs that clearly conform to the PSA plan, but the Zoning Officer must consult the Planning
59 Board on any new or changed signs if a judgment is required regarding the new or changed signs being in
60 conformance with the PSA plan. Dubow added that if the Board felt that this change did in fact conform
61 to the VLP PSA document, then they could make a statement to that effect and there would be no need for
62 the Board to make a formal amendment to the PSA document for the VLP.

63 After a short discussion the Planning Board determined that the change to the pylon sign
64 ultimately conformed to the VLP PSA document and therefore the requested approval could be granted
65 by the Zoning Officer. The Board also requested/recommended that plantings (bushes) be planted around
66 the base of the pylon sign and that some type of improvement could be made to the west side of the
67 building to improve the appearance.

68 Kanter moved the pylon sign, as presented, conformed to the VLP PSA document, and therefore
69 the requested approval could be granted by the Zoning Officer. Seconded by Schleelein; Ayes: Tomei,
70 Stycos, Kanter, Schleelein, and Dankert.

71

72

73 **Reports**

74 *Tomei reported on the December 3rd Board of Trustees meeting and for a report of the meeting*
75 *please see the Trustee minutes.*

76 **Approval of Minutes**

77 None

78

79 **Other Business**

80 Moseley indicated that materials for the CU Suites project, on Cinema Drive, should have been
81 provided to Tompkins County for a 239 –l and –m review. Moseley indicated that this oversight was
82 unintentional and all materials have been provided to Tompkins County for their review of the project.
83 Moseley indicated that the 239 –l and –m is required because the project is less than 500 feet from the
84 neighboring municipality.

85 **Adjournment**

86 Schleelein moved to adjourn at 8:15 PM. Seconded by Stycos; Ayes: Tomei, Stycos, Kanter, Schleelein,
87 and Dankert.