

**Village of Lansing**  
**Planning Board Meeting**

**August 31, 1999**

The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:10 p.m. by Chairman Hickey. Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Brown, Halevy, Klepack, Waterman, Village Attorney Marcus, Code Enforcement Officer Curtis, and Village Engineer Cross and Trustee Liaison Leopold.

The consultant scheduled to meet with the Board at 7:00 was delayed so Chairman Hickey reordered the agenda to two minor subdivision requests while the Board waited.

**Babcock Subdivision – Classification**

Delores Babcock of 2553 North Triphammer Road has applied to subdivide her 3.69 acre lot into two lots, one 2.03 acre lot where her house is currently located and one 1.66 acre lot to the south in the medium Density residential District, Tax Parcel Number 44.1-1-35.1. Halevy moved the subdivision be classified a minor subdivision. Seconded by Brown. All in favor.

**Seacord Subdivision - Classification**

Ron and Ereign Seacord have applied to amend an earlier subdivision by moving the lot line separating 1437 East Shore Drive, Tax parcel No. 43.1-1-17.2, and the vacant lot south of 1437 East Shore Drive, currently included in Tax Parcel No. 43.1-1-17.21, approximately 5 feet to the north at its intersection with the Cayuga Heights road right-of-way so as to reduce the area of the parcel known as 1437 East Shore Drive, and increase the area of the vacant lot to the south currently included in that same tax parcel. Waterman moved that the subdivision be classified as a minor subdivision. Klepack seconded. All in favor.

**Highgate Circle Street Number**

S. Kasimov and Y. Kurbanova have purchased the vacant lot next to 1 Highgate Circle and across the street from 1107 Highland Road. They are building a house and need an address. Curtis recommends 1106 Highland Road. He has checked with Fire Control and that address is the the one they prefer. Waterman moved to assign 1106 Highland Road as the address for this lot. Seconded by Brown, All in favor.

**Planning Consultant Interview**

The Planning Board interviewed David Crandall of Environmental Design Planning Consultants. He explained that they are more designers than planners. They design with an emphasis on the natural and cultural environment. They recently worked on a project in Canandaigua which included calming and controlling an anticipated upsurge in traffic, enhancing the streetscape, designing transportation systems, accommodating tour busses, etc. They have traffic engineers on staff and know how to work with NYSDOT. They have also done projects for the towns of Manlius, Victor and Casanovia. They believe in mixed use and could work that concept into the CLT design. They believe the public should be involved from day one. He noted that 90% of the projects that they have planned or designed have then actually been done.

**Public Comment**

Klepack moved to close the Public Comment portion of the meeting as there was no one present who wished to speak. Seconded by Halevy. All in favor.

**Public Hearing - Special Permit #1479, Tops Market, Inc.**

to construct a one story 48,208 s.f. supermarket and 19,200 s.f. retail/restaurant outparcel building at 2300 North Triphammer Road, the property currently occupied by the Howard Johnson Motel, in the Commercial High Traffic District, Tax Parcel Numbr 47.1-1-21.

Hickey opened the public hearing:

Dr. Evan Meltzer spoke in favor of having a Tops Market in that location. His office is diagonally across the street. He said he would like to see more retail competition there and that it will be good for the Village to have another place to shop. Mrs. Meltzer also spoke in favor of having that space occupied rather than remaining an eyesore, and said she would hope that Triphammer Road would be able to handle the volume of traffic.

Mike Ward, 107 Oakcrest Road, said that to the best of his knowledge the residential roads were not being included in the traffic study and he feels it is important that this be considered. Traffic studies show that traffic on Oakcrest Road has doubled from 1994 to 1998 and the majority of traffic is traveling from 42 to 58 miles per hour. He feels he will be impacted by the traffic generated by this development and his property value will probably go down because of that. He would like to see growth in the community but it has to be done responsibly.

Sorrel Gottfried said that the traffic is the main issue and she would like to be able to comment after the traffic study. She seconded the suggestion that all the side roads be looked at as well, and was concerned about additional traffic generated by the development.

Laurel Hodkin, 23 Oakcrest Road, said she was also concerned with the volume and speed of traffic on Oakcrest Road and felt that any commercial venture that would add to that is excessive. She said that if it has to happen, she hopes traffic can be diverted off residential streets.

Rita Smidt, 120 Oakcrest Road, said that many people may have comments about traffic and proposed solutions and it would be useful to say that in public where they can contribute to each other's thinking. She asked that the Board consider holding another public hearing after that traffic study is available. She said that the discussion they have heard so far is how to move the traffic efficiently and safely, but their concerns regarding the residential roads cannot be solved simply by moving the traffic faster. She said that the other concern that she has been stressing in all the communications that she has made to the Board is the concern with the financial impact as well as the environmental impact. She suggested that the developer be asked to pay for the installation of a traffic light, and possibly sidewalks or street lights to give added protection to the people on the residential roads.

As no one else wished to speak, Waterman moved to close the Public Hearing. Klepack seconded. All in favor.

The Tops representatives said they have commissioned a comprehensive traffic study of the effect of the proposed Tops and the combined development of Tops and Pyramid Mall on the Pyramid Drive area, on N. Triphammer Road, and other roads near the mall, based on the construction of a 51,000 s.f. Tops Market and 19,000 s.f. of retail space. They have added 3,000 s.f. to the Tops building, but have not increased the number of parking spaces. They are proposing 362 parking spaces out of the 392 permitted. They also moved the store back into an area that they had previously kept for an expansion area because of the grading plan and they eliminated the driveway from behind the building down to Pyramid Drive.

There will be approximately 3 deliveries per day by large 18-wheeler trucks, either early in the morning or in the later afternoon, but not normally during busy traffic hours.

Hickey felt that the previous plan was a safer way for trucks to negotiate through the parking area. Waterman expressed concern about the parking arrangement because it would have cars backing out into traffic.

Engineer David Herrick spoke about grading and landscaping issues. He said that the site represents 30 feet of fall in grade from one end to the other. The problem has been to maintain access to the buildings and keep the parking area at a consistent and easy grade. They went through several iterations to develop a plan that fell within Tops guidelines for developing parking lot grades and access to buildings, and ended up with roughly a 3% slope. By eliminating the rear

driveway they were able to pull the grade up from 15% at the corner and develop some flatter parking and truck access.

Hickey asked if having two entrances off of Pyramid Drive was a Tops requirement and asked why one entrance wouldn't work as well. The Tops representative said it was a safety factor and distributes the traffic more evenly. One driveway will have a light and the other won't. Cross noted that the Tops representatives had previously stated that two entrances were desirable because of the benefit to their retail tenants to get the parking closer to the building. The Tops representative confirmed that it is important for them to be able to deliver traffic to the retailer unobstructed.

Marcus said that the Board has consistently heard that one of the goals for improving the safety on N. Triphammer Road is to reduce the number of curb cuts. Generally if you take a strip of road and diminish the number of curb cuts and therefore the number of cars turning onto and off the road it produces a safer situation. He asked why two curb cuts on this stretch of Pyramid Drive would be safer than one curb cut, and how it can be distinguished from the circumstances they have heard about on N. Triphammer where diminishing the number of curb cuts is intended to achieve a goal of a safer stretch of road.

The Tops engineer said that there isn't that much traffic on Pyramid Drive where you would have the same kind of accident potential as on N. Triphammer Road. Waterman felt that the more cuts you have the greater the risk and there is a lot of traffic that goes down Pyramid Drive. The Tops traffic engineer said that it has been his experience that limiting the driveways on a typical arterial like N. Triphammer Road is a good idea. The issue revolves around vehicles that are slowing down in the main traffic to allow someone to turn right or left so the theory is that you improve traffic flow along the arterial when you consolidate driveways. However on Pyramid Drive he didn't have a problem with two driveways because Pyramid Drive is not a primary road like North Triphammer, but more an access road for which there are different standards. He said that from a site engineering and traffic flow standpoint, if you try to consolidate access into one curb cut you're violating the natural driver behavior of individuals that expect to have driveways at certain places on a site.

Hickey felt that one driveway would be less complicated and that two entrances adds additional points of conflict for crossing traffic. He proposed a hypothetical solution of putting in a central driveway 80 feet to the west with a traffic light to control turning movements. Klepack suggested a central driveway which would immediately split with access roads going to the retail outparcel and to the supermarket. Hickey said that the Board would like to see an alternative plan and see why it will or won't work before they are convinced that having two entrances is the best plan. The Tops representatives will work with Brent Cross on a more acceptable access plan.

The comprehensive traffic study is not yet complete.

The Board began conduct of its SEQRA review. (see SEQRA form for additional detail)

- Impact on land: Yes, going from a 33% lot coverage of impervious material to 75% coverage will have a small to moderate impact. There is nothing in the Village's Zoning Law that limits lot coverage in a property but it has an impact.
- Impact on drainage flow patterns or surface runoff: Yes. There is an increase of about 42% on impervious surfaces. Potentially large impact but can be mitigated.
- Impact on open space and recreation: Yes. Reduction of open green space and lawn landscaping by one-third.
- Impact on Transportation: Yes. The Board needs to review the comprehensive traffic study.
- Impact on noise and odor: Yes, cooking odors from a restaurant. Small impact.
- Impact on growth and character of community and likelihood of public controversy: Deferred until the Board has more information.

Cross reviewed his Engineer's Report:

Drainage is shown and they are working on the calculations. The Tops plan indicates a trash compactor area in the back which Cross assumed would be in lieu of the dumpster but he did not see any provision for either. He needs to see the light distribution pattern. Utilities are not shown. In the SEQRA application they estimate a certain amount of water consumption that would translate into 27 units of sewer. We need to confirm the process of calculating the water

estimate.

Hickey summarized that the Board still needs to review the traffic study, site plan alternatives, including parking, and the landscaping plan. :

**Bill Cooke Chevrolet, Oldsmobile, Cadillac, Inc.** - Developer's Conference

The site configuration of this property is grandfathered, and the Board has been asked to amend their previous buffer requirement so that Mr. Cooke can expand the business. The proposal is that trees and a stockade fence will constitute the buffer. Hickey said that some trees are on this property and some off, and Mr. Cooke will have to put some new trees in on the south boundary where there are no trees. The combination of the trees and the stockade fence 15 feet from the property would constitute a buffer. Hickey suggested that the stockade fence be staggered with shrubs to enhance the appearance. Klepack felt that this is an improvement upon what might be there right now given that's it's grandfathered.

Waterman moved to approve the modification of the buffer requested by Mr. Cooke. That is, the buffer will now be the 15 foot setback line with trees added where necessary and an attractive fence to be installed, the design of which is to be approved by the Planning Board. Marcus reminded the Board that no request for its action had been made at this point.

A straw vote was taken and the Board members unanimously expressed their positive response to the proposal. Mr. Cooke was given the assurance of the Board that this buffer proposal will be approved when he comes in with the Special Permit application.

**Special Permit #1466, Pyramid Company of Ithaca**

Hickey said that the new site map shows the 20% area set-aside which will remain green space. There is also a new parking calculation with the total number of slots. Hickey said that by eliminating the food with bar category they could save 180 parking spaces. Jim Tull of Pyramid Mall said that what they had in mind was a combination restaurant/bar with a 5,000 foot game room attached. Curtis said that there is the flexibility within the Zoning Law to break out the arcade and restaurant as separate spaces.

The Board still needs to review the landscaping plan. Marcus noted that in each of the two Special Permit discussions, comments were made as to replacing trees that were to be removed tree for tree, and replacing noise barriers, and those should be depicted on the plan so the Board has a visual tool to reference what was said.

**New Business**

- Hickey said that there is a conference in Rochester on September 24-25 which deals with Open Space. The Village will fund anyone who wishes to attend.
- Hickey asked the Board whether or not to hold another Public Hearing on the Tops proposal. Board members felt that this would be appropriate since the traffic study was not available for review. However, the scope of the Public Hearing will be limited to transportation issues only.

**Adjourn**

Waterman moved that the meeting be adjourned at 9:55 p.m. Klepack seconded. All in favor.