

Village of Lansing
Planning Board Meeting
Monday
April 8, 2019

The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:01PM by Chair, Mike Baker.

Present at the meeting: Planning Board Members; Mike Baker, Carolyn Greenwald, Jim McCauley, Monica Moll, and Alternate Member, Anthony Ingraffea; Code Enforcement Officer, Mike Scott; Village Attorney, David Dubow; Village Trustee Liaison, Patricia O'Rourke; George Turner of Saratoga Associates; John Snyder of John Snyder Architects; and Phil Maguire of Maguire Family Limited Partnership; Eric Goetzmann, Jim Bold; Board of Zoning Appeals Board members, Lynn Leopold and Roy Hogben.

Absent: Chair; Lisa Schleelein

Baker stated he would be filling in as Chair for Schleelein.

Baker appointed Ingraffea as an acting member for the meeting due to the absence of Planning Board member, Schleelein.

Public Comment Period

Baker opened the public comment period.

Patricia O'Rourke spoke saying she was present as the liaison for the Board of Trustees.

With no one wishing to speak, Greenwald moved to close the public comment period. Seconded by Ingraffea.

Ayes by: Baker, Greenwald, Ingraffea, McCauley, and Moll.

Public Hearing for Special Permit #4233 Proposed by Finger Lakes Tram LLC.

The applicants are seeking approval for installing an approximately 200 ft. long Tram system which includes a hoist drum/frame and cabin to hold up to 4 people. The Tram, located at 1510 East Shore Drive (Tax Parcel #42.1-1-46.11), will run from the existing home down to the shore level of Cayuga Lake.

There was no one in attendance to present the above Special Permit request. Scott said the representatives for Finger Lakes Tram would most likely be in attendance at a May meeting. Baker advised the public hearing will stay open.

Continue Public Hearing for Special Permit #4242 Proposed by Maguire Nissan of Ithaca.

The proposed project will include development of 35 Cinema Drive (Tax Parcel # 46.-1-6-5.1) which is a 4 acre commercial property – consisting of an existing Chevrolet Cadillac dealership, and a presented new Nissan dealership. The proposed action includes: construction of a two story, 25,235 SqFt (Gross Floor Area) sales and service building with associated parking; public water, sewer and electrical services; pedestrian and vehicular circulation; site lighting and signage; retaining wall; fence screening; landscaping; and improvements to existing curb cuts along Cinema Drive and Uptown Road.

49 Turner said they submitted a revised proposal for the signage and explained the revisions, and addressed
50 concerns of the Village of Lansing's Highway Department (DPW). He stated they revised the walkway
51 on Cinema Drive and talked about the runoff and how they put in a water and a sediment trap for ease to
52 the cistern. In addition, he talked about the request for a sidewalk on Uptown Road and said they would
53 plan for it if the Planning Board requested one.

54

55 Snyder showed a power point presentation of three options they had for their revised signage proposals.
56 Option A and C proposed 380.5 sq. ft and option B proposed 488.5 sq. ft. He talked about pylon signs
57 versus stanchion signs and advised they would like to go with a pylon sign as he felt that was a better
58 architectural fit for the area. Snyder reviewed the sizes and scale of the signs. He said they would like to
59 go with an option where the canopy would be lit and the pylon would not be illuminated, or be lit on a
60 schedule.

61

62 Greenwald said she drove by the Nissan dealership in Cortland and stated no signs were illuminated and
63 thought the Nissan letters in the sign were visible without being lit. She thought it looked good. Maguire
64 stated that dealership was still under construction. Moll asked what would be lit on the canopy. Snyder
65 said it would be based on the approved option. There was discussion on what signs would be lit.
66 Maguire said their choice would be the square of the sign above the building be lit. He said he would like
67 the Boards recommendation of what to submit to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA).

68

69 Baker talked about their signage and the signage at the Chevy/Cadillac dealership. From his computer,
70 Snyder showed a picture of another Nissan dealership to show what the Nissan sign would look like.
71 Turner said if the BZA approved the signage variance their hope is to get other approvals to continue.

72

73 Turner asked about the sidewalk concerns of the Village of Lansing's DPW and asked the Board for
74 recommendations. Greenwald said they should definitely plan for a sidewalk as there are many people
75 that walk in that area. Baker agreed. There was conversation regarding sidewalks. Maguire asked for
76 clarification. Baker said there has been a lot of conversation regarding the addition of sidewalks in the
77 Village and stated the Board would like to see them add sidewalks in their plans, however, they do not
78 necessarily need to be in this phase of their project. There was continued conversation regarding bus
79 stops, crosswalks, and the location of where future sidewalks were going to be put in. Scott said he would
80 ask the opinion of John Courtney, Superintendent of the Village of Lansing's DPW, and they would also
81 work with Cross.

82

83 Cross talked about the vertical grade change and the drainage concerns and asked about the runoff
84 accumulation and the cistern. Turner discussed how the cistern is intended to work.

85

86 Maguire asked if they should submit all three options to the BZA or asked for the Boards
87 recommendation of which option they should submit. Baker explained they can only submit one option,
88 however, the other two options could be added as a condition. He said they should submit the option that
89 reduced the most square footage and had less lit signs. Leopold said they should submit the best option
90 that fit closest with the Village Code. Dubow said there could be modifications and adjusted provisions

91 added on, and that would be determined by the BZA. Cross explained his understanding. Baker talked
92 about the variance and that the BZA would base on the 380 square footage and if they went with a larger
93 amount they would have to do more mailings.

94

95 Maguire asked the Board which option they liked the most. Ingraffea gave his suggestion. Greenwald
96 said the most appropriate approach would be what the Code states. McCauley agreed. Moll said she likes
97 the aesthetics, however, they should stick close to the Code. Baker agreed with everyone's comments.
98 Maguire said they would submit one option to the BZA.

99

100 **Informal Review of Special Permit #4258**

101 Eric Goetzmann, representing Arrowhead Ventures, is proposing a change to the Residential Units of
102 Area B in the Lansing Meadows PDA located on Oakcrest Road (Tax Parcel #47.1-1-17.21). The
103 Planning Board will review this proposal (Special Permit #4258) to determine whether it is a major or
104 minor change from the approved site plan.

105

106 *Arrowhead Ventures LLC*
107 *10 W. Genesee St, Suite 6*
108 *Skaneateles, N.Y. 13152*

109 *April 2, 2019*

110

111 *Village of Lansing Planning Board Members*

112 *Attn: Mike Scott*

113 *2405 North Triphammer Road*

114 *Ithaca, NY 14850*

115

116 *Re: Amendment to Special Permit*

117

118 *Dear Planning Board Members,*

119

120 *Please accept this letter as my formal request to amend Arrowhead Ventures LLC special Permit to construct*
121 *Residential Units in the Lansing Meadows PDA in the Village of Lansing.*

122

123 *Arrowhead Ventures is requesting a minor amendment to our approved Special Permit. Based upon recently*
124 *completed housing projects and projects under construction in the Village of Lansing we have decided to*
125 *make a minor change in our construction schedule and build our homes in two phases. The first phase of our*
126 *project will include (4) buildings located on Oakcrest Road in the same location as the approved Special Permit.*
127 *The units along Oakcrest will have driveways that connect directly to Oakcrest Road. Although the driveway*
128 *connections we are proposing will be slightly different, the buildings and connections will provide for more of a*
129 *residential fed to this portion of Oakcrest Road. The new units will be smaller than the original 1,500 sf units*
130 *thus allowing us to build (3) units instead of (2) units on a similar footprint of the duplex.*

131

132 *Attached for your review is our application to amend our special permit with all of the relevant information*
133 *the village request to proceed with an amendment. We have also included for your review: a revised site plan,*
134 *revised site plan highlighting changes and a deviation of the residential units.*

135

136 *We look forward to beginning construction on our new housing project as soon as possible.*

137

138 *Thank you for your consideration.*

139 *Eric Goetzmann*

140

141 Eric Goetzmann stated he was at the meeting with Jim Bold to explain their updated proposal for their
142 development on Oakcrest Road. He talked about the modifications and asked if the Board would approve
143 the minor amendments. He explained the footprint and road access and he thought it would make more
144 sense for them to phase this project. Goetzmann said a change would be the traffic on Oakcrest.

145

146 Baker asked if they were increasing the density. Dubow talked about the changes to the original Planned
147 Development Area (PDA) and the special permit. There was conversation regarding the PDA, densities,
148 setback variations, and if approvals would need to go through the Board of Trustees. There was
149 additional conversation regarding what was originally approved versus what is now being proposed.
150 Goetzmann said they are trying to do their changes under the special permit. Dubow stated that the
151 original plan was for duplexes and now the front four homes are proposed as triplexes, and each time
152 there are other changes. Baker said no vote is required to be made at tonight's meeting.

153

154 Cross read through his engineering report and explained his findings and recommendations;

155

VILLAGE OF LANSING
ENGINEER'S REPORT

156

159 **DATE:** *April 8, 2019*

160

161 **TO:** *Planning Board*

162

163 **FROM:** *Brent A. Cross, Village Engineer*

164

165 **RE:** *Lansing Meadows PDA (LMPDA)*

166

167 **NOTE:** *I have reviewed the developer's request for a "minor modification" to the above PDA. I have the following*
168 *observations:*

169

170

1. *The reversal of the buildings to front on to Oakcrest Road will result in the addition of 8 new curb cuts and 12 new driveways. Although the FHA classifies the road as a functional "local" street, the Village Road Design Standards suggest that it would be considered "local service & access road" (less than 400 ADT). Therefore, good engineering practice would be to limit (not restrict) driveways/curbcuts/access road to a minimum. I tried to look up standards from other gov't agencies to provide guidance on how far apart driveways should be located. Although I did not find a consistent dimension, the low side of range was either 50' or 60% of the lot frontage. These driveways/curbcuts appear to be between 15'-40' apart.*

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

2. *The revised LMPDA is proposed to be constructed in 2 phases, the second phase will add the previously approved "minor modification" to construct a private road (to serve the remainder of the dwelling units along the south side of the property) with 2 access points onto Oakcrest Road. Although these two access roads were considered to reasonably far apart to not cause a danger intersection condition, the newly proposed direct driveways will put 12 dwelling units in-between the 2 intersections. As a side note to the future private road, the site distance in the "tight curves" will be further reduced by the proposed "minor revision".*

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

- 187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
3. *The closest adjacent driveways would be approximately 25' from the future road intersections. This is extremely less than the recommended 100'-200' in the design standards.*
 4. *Although the zoning regulations for the LMPDA does not give a specific dimension for "parking in setbacks" (see original "plat" in Appendix D), leaving the current regulations "silent". In absence of a specific regulation for the parking setback in the LMPDA, I would compare similar regulations in the underlying Low Density Residential (20') and the Commercial Low Traffic (25'). The revised minor request does not appear to provide any room for parking of vehicles other than directly in the front yard setback.*
 5. *Since the revised proposal will be putting the front doors of 12 residential units facing the public ROW, would this be the appropriate time to address a permanent pedestrian facility in the ROW?*
 6. *The other aspects of the project including stormwater management and public utilities will not change significantly. Except that the potential build-out would increase from 20 dwelling units to 36 dwelling units, therefore, there will be additional 16 units of sewer allocation.*

205 Cross said he did not think the changes would be considered minor changes.

206

207 Baker read through an email written by the Village of Lansing's Highway Superintendent, John Courtney

208

209 *Hi Mike,*

210

211 *After a quick review I have the following concerns.*

212 *1. The Number of driveways proposed causes a great concern for the plowing of snow. In these situations most*
213 *contractors back drag the snow away from the buildings causing the plow truck to enter the road until far enough*
214 *to get behind snow and push the snow across the road. This is a violation of Vehicle and Traffic Law 1219. In reality*
215 *there is just no place to pile snow without doing so near the building or on the end of the culvert pipe often*
216 *plugging the inlet/outlets of the pipe.*

217

218 *2. The curb cuts as designed would allow a limited number of parked vehicles and the overflow tend to park in the*
219 *road.*

220

221 *3. Increased maintenance of ditch line maintained by Village.*

222

223 *4. Traffic hazards with vehicles entering roadway often backing rather than coming to he proposed design curb-cut*
224 *stop signs.*

225

226 *If this were allowed some conditions should be set.*

227

228 *1. No parking signs be placed along roadway.*

229 *2. Storm sewer the ditch adding catch basing between drives.*

230 *3. Condition snow piles be placed in a location out of the right away. This would eliminate plantings that could be*
231 *compromised by the snow.*

232 *4. Not sure how to handle vehicles entering roadway.*

233

234 *Thanks for your consideration.*

235 *John*

236

237 Baker said Schleelein had expressed concern that there is no option other than for the residents to back
238 out of their driveway onto Oakcrest Road. He talked about the changes of the units being originally
239 duplexes and now proposing triplexes and said there seems to be more going on than just adding a few
240 more units.

241

242 There was continued discussion regarding Oakcrest Road being a public road and the concern of vehicles
243 backing out onto the road. Dubow said this is a PDA. Goetzmann referenced other roads in the Village
244 that had vehicles backing out onto those roads. Baker said we are not talking about those roads and
245 maybe they are not the safest setup where we would not want to add another. McCauley said the other
246 areas may have stop signs to slow the traffic down. Moll asked if they considered putting the garages on
247 the backside of the units. Bold talked about the cost of the sewer and not being affordable, and doing a
248 lot of infrastructure work to put the garages in the back. There was continued conversation regarding the
249 provisions of the PDA and updated proposal. Dubow said the area was intended for senior living and
250 because the demands might be different today that does not mean the Village has to do anything different
251 than what was intended. Goetzmann talked about the special permit and said he is not trying to change
252 the PDA, but rather to amend the special permit.

253

254 Greenwald asked if this is a minor or major change. The Board agreed it was a major change. Baker
255 agreed. He expressed concern there is no guarantee they would pursue phase 2. There was continued
256 conversation regarding possible conditions and Courtney's concerns. Baker said there would be
257 conditions set if this was voted as a major change.

258

259 Scott explained what they would have to do if they pursued this proposal and also they would have to go
260 back to the County for a 239 review, along with a public hearing.

261

262 Dubow referenced the PDA and suggested they figure out a middle ground that would be valuable to the
263 Village and where everyone can work together. He said it is important that this project is done properly.

264 Goetzmann said he thought he was following the curb-cuts and proposing attractive buildings.

265 Greenwald said there should be sidewalks considered in their plans.

266

267 Baker said there could possibly be a vote at the next meeting. He continued to talk about the traffic
268 concerns and infrastructures, and said he thought the proposed buildings are attractive.

269

270 Ingraffea talked about the PDA and the view for the neighborhood and expressed concern that the
271 neighborhood would be looking at the backside of the structures. There was conversation regarding
272 financial reasons why they had to change the view of the structures, discussion of the sewer changes, and
273 the changes to the PDA.

274

275 Cross asked about the current sewer and if they would have to move its location in this phase. Bold said
276 the sewer could be kept under the road in the first phase and be moved in phase 2.

277

278 Cross and Goetzmann discussed the curb-cuts and Oakcrest Road being residential. Cross talked about
279 the stormwater and what is required by the DEC before signing off on a permit. There was discussion of
280 what was approved at the time BJ's was constructed. Scott said he would do research regarding
281 concerned issues.

282

283 Bold said they would consider all of the comments given and will come back at a later meeting.

284

285 **Approval of Minutes:**

286

287 **March 26, 2019**

288 Moll moved to accept the minutes of March 26, 2019. Seconded by McCauley;

289 Ayes by; Baker, Greenwald, McCauley, and Moll.

290 Nays: None:

291 Absent: Schleelein

292

293 **Trustee Report:**

294 Greenwald reported on the Trustee meeting of April 1, 2019. For a complete report of the meeting please
295 see the Trustee minutes.

296

297 **Other Business if time permits:**

298 Baker talked about the trucks crossing over the Triphammer bridge overpass for the building project on
299 the Cornell campus regardless of the direction they exited Route 13. Conversation regarding the
300 restrictions the Village of Cayuga Heights could incorporate and how those regulations could benefit the
301 Village of Lansing. Moll asked if there was a survey that could be done that would show if there were
302 damages done to the bridge due to the truck traffic. Cross said the bridge is a NYS DOT bridge and that
303 there would be a meeting with the Village of Cayuga Heights Trustees regarding a road usage agreement
304 or permits that could be required in case of damage. He explained what conditions they may determine
305 and regulate. There was conversation of this construction being done at the north campus and what is
306 being built.

307

308 Greenwald suggested there should be scheduled Planning Board meetings that would be dedicated to
309 discuss ideas and projects. All Board members agreed.

310

311 Moll said she would not be at the April 30, 2019 Planning Board meeting.

312

313 **Adjournment:**

314 Greenwald moved to adjourn at 8:52 PM. Seconded by Moll.

315 Ayes by: Baker, Greenwald, Ingraffea, McCauley, and Moll.

316

317 Minutes taken by: Tammy Milliman, PT Clerk

318

319

320