

Village of Lansing

Planning Board Meeting

October 26, 1999

The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Hickey. Present at the meeting were Planning Board Members Brown, Halevy, Klepack, Waterman, Village Attorney Marcus, Code Enforcement Officer Curtis, Village Engineer Cross, and Trustee Liaison Leopold.

Public Comment

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

Integrated Acquisition & Development - Public Hearing

Special Permit #1491, Integrated Acquisition & Development, to construct a one-story 10,700 s.f. medical office building at 30 Arrowwood Drive in the Human Health Services District, Tax Parcel Number 45.1-1-57.2

Herman Sieverding presented the site design for the fourth and final medical building which will house three tenants. The building will be similar in size and design to the other three. This site is located at the intersection of Brentwood and Arrowwood Drives. Due to a couple of principal considerations they made the curb cut on Brentwood. They rejected Arrowwood as the site for the curb cut because of sight distance and the desire not to create a parallel route that would take you via curb cut from Arrowwood through the parking lot in front of Building 4 into the parking lot in front of Building 3. They really wanted to direct that traffic over to Brentwood where it properly belongs from a traffic safety point of view. Once you gain access to the site from the curb cut on Brentwood, you drive to a parking area which is divided into two sections corresponding to each of the principal elevations of the building. There are a total of 59 parking spaces shown on the site plan, including 4 handicapped spaces - two in front of each of those principle facades where there are individual entrances to each of the three tenancies in the building. There is a sidewalk that would run along the edge of the parking lot and connect to the existing sidewalk in front of the Building 1 and connects via the driveway to Building 4 and 3 with the existing sidewalk in front of Building 3. All four buildings would be connected via this sidewalk that runs along the edge of the parking lots. Landscaping design includes berming of the 75 feet of area between Brentwood and the parking lot and the edge of Arrowwood Drive and the parking lot on the eastern end of the building. The berming, landscaping and lighting will be similar in context to what has been done elsewhere. A landscape and lighting plan will be submitted at a later date. Hickey reminded them to be careful about the lighting on the south side that faces residential property across Arrowwood.

There is a dumpster in the corner of the lot tucked into a berm similar to the other dumpsters on the site. In this case because of the landscaping around the dumpster, it will be nicely shielded from sight from Brentwood. The building itself fits well within all the setback requirements. It is within the 25 foot sideyard setback requirement on the west and north side of the property.

The detailing of the building is exactly like the other 3 buildings on the site - a combination of clapboard siding with shingles at the upper level, double hung windows, and separate entries that jut out from the main building. The color scheme will be exactly as other buildings.

Klepack said that there was going to be a pedestrian walkway put in from Warren Road south of Arrowwood so people wouldn't have to walk up the road. Carolyn Hoyt from Cornell Real Estate said that there is currently no plan to build that walkway. Hickey said that he thought it was going to be built along with the construction of Arrowwood Road. He asked for a plan for completion of that blacktop walkway.

To calculate parking spaces they used the Lansing Zoning Law Off-Street Parking requirements of 4 spaces per practitioner and one space per staff member. Tenant one will have 2 doctors and 3 staff; Tenant 2 will have 2 doctors, 2 Physician Assistants, and 5 staff; Tenant 3 will have 3 doctors, 2 Physician Assistants, and 7 staff members. They

counted Physician Assistants as practitioners. This totals 59 spaces, and they do not wish to take the 20% reduction.

They do ask potential tenants to fill out a survey for the purpose of determining parking needs. Hickey asked for something in writing to put in the application to support the calculations

Hickey opened the Public Hearing:

Mafalda Moore, who lives across the street on Arrowwood Drive, expressed concern for some of the old trees on the lot. Sieverding said that most of the trees will have to come down, but they will be replacing the number and species of trees that are removed as part of the landscaping plan. If they are able to save any of those trees it will be shown on the landscaping plan.

She also expressed concern about the corner of Brentwood and Arrowwood. Hickey said this would need to be evaluated in terms of traffic safety and if the design of the road is such that it creates a safety hazard, if necessary a control will have to be installed. He said that when plans come in for future development of the remaining property, the Planning Board will look at that intersection and make sure that proper signage goes in there. If there is a need for signage now we'll present it to Mr. Majeroni and see what we can do about it. He also said that a street light will be installed at the intersection of Warren Road and Arrowwood Drive.

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

Cross said that regarding drainage, there was no provision on Lot #4 for stormwater retention and it is directed toward the pond in front of Building #1. He recalls that this was done for Lot #1, and that they upsized the pond to cover Lot #4. Tim Colbert of Integrated Acquisition has offered to have T.G. Miller demonstrate that the detention on Lot #1 is sufficient for this development as well. Hickey said that as a condition of the Special Permit, the Village Engineer will have final approval on all drainage issues.

Cross said that Integrated Acquisition requested a sewer allocation equal to the previous two buildings, which was one permit. They have found that the actual water consumption for the three other buildings is higher than one. However, Cross said that they think the reason is high amounts of irrigation this summer so they just have to figure all that out and it looks like it will probably be one permit requested. Hickey reminded Carolyn that they have 3 sewer permits allocated to 10 Brown Road which has not been built yet and that three units is more than similar buildings in the Park have required. Hickey said that they need to consider using one of those sewer permits. Halevy suggested that if they do not use all three sewer permits allocated to 10 Brown Road, they should return one to the Village. Hickey said that the Board will need an agreement on this.

The Board conducted the SEQRA review. Waterman moved that the Board find that the proposed action will cause no significant adverse environmental impacts. Seconded by Klepack. All in favor.

The Board reviewed the General Conditions Required for all Special Permits, pursuant to Section 304.05 of the Zoning Law. Waterman moved that the Board find that all of the General Conditions have been met. Seconded by Halevy. All in favor.

Conditions:

1. Drainage plan has to be approved by Village Engineer.
2. Implementation of a landscaping plan and lighting plan which includes photometrics to be reviewed by the Greenspace Advisory Committee and approved by the Planning Board at a later date.
3. Documentation of parking calculations.
4. An agreement on sewer permits.

Waterman moved to approve Special Permit # 1491 with conditions. Seconded by Klepack. All in favor.

The Board would like a plan in the spring showing a date for construction of the pedestrian walkway, but this is not a condition of approval.

Special Permit #1479, Tops Market, Inc. - Continued Discussion

The Board reviewed and made a minor correction to the SEQRA. Klepack moved to approve. Seconded by Halevy. All in favor.

Hickey reported that the Board received a letter from Tops Corporation dated October 22, 1999, in which they have decided to increase mitigation of traffic problems in working with NYS DOT by replacing and connecting a hard wire synchronizing circuit for traffic lights on the bridge and also in front of Triphammer Mall and at Pyramid Drive. They also agreed to install a light at the intersection of Graham Road and N. Triphammer Road. All of this is in addition to the light that they requested for the entrance to Tops on Pyramid Drive. So it's a very positive statement to benefit the Village and residents of Lansing to improve the traffic flow along N. Triphammer Road.

Hickey reported that the Board is in receipt of a report from Sear-Brown dated 10/18/99 on the Traffic Impact Studies -- Proposed Tops Market and Mall Expansion. They have gone through all the data and said that traffic being generated by Tops will have no significant adverse impact on traffic after the mitigation measures noted above have been implemented.

Cross said that he recalled that Tops and the Planning Board had discussed treatment of contamination from the runoff from paved surfaces and the possibility of using plantings on the bottom of the basin to provide for sedimentation and filtration. The Tops representative said that the basins are designed to meter the water out to a French drain system beneath the basin itself. As for contaminants and toxic pollutants Hickey said that Tops did agree that they could investigate or add whatever type of vegetation might be appropriate such as cattails or some other type of vegetation that would absorb contaminants.

Cross also noted that under item #2 of the County Planning Department's concerns, it says that if expansion of Pyramid Mall is undertaken additional studies may be required to assess the capacity of downstream channels and culverts. He said that we don't have to do that because subdivision regulations regarding storm water management states that Tops and Pyramid Mall will provide storm water management facilities such that the amount of water that leaves the site is not greater than before the development. So the idea is that there won't be any more runoff, and potentially less. So Cross did not feel that that is an accurate assessment.

The review of the Lighting Plan by Lighting Commission will be a condition of approval.

For parking spaces, Tops asked for more than they are required to provide, but less than the 20% over that number that they are permitted to have.

The letter from Tops will be attached as an enclosure to the Special Permit and implementation the work described therein to the satisfaction of the Village and NYSDOT will be a condition of the Certificate of Occupancy.

The Board reviewed the General Conditions Required for all Special Permits, pursuant to Section 304.05 of the Zoning Law. Halevy moved that the Board find that all of the General Conditions have been met. Seconded by Waterman. All in favor.

Conditions:

1. The October 22, 1999 letter from Tops Corporation to Ned Hickey regarding traffic mitigation measures will be attached as a condition of the Special Permit and those conditions must be met before the Certificate of Occupancy is issued;
2. Appropriate plantings must be placed in the detention pond to improve the quality of runoff water.
3. Implementation of a lighting plan approved by the Lighting Commission.
4. Implementation of the landscaping plan which has already been approved by the Planning Board.
5. Final approval of the drainage plan by the Village Engineer.
6. Tops must manage traffic during the construction period so as not to impair the quality of the roads or impede traffic.

7. Throughout the project, rerouting of the new sewer line has been discussed. The final plan must be approved by the Superintendent of Public Works.

Klepach moved to grant the permit subject to the conditions listed above. Seconded by Halevy. All in favor.

Special Permit #1466 Pyramid Company of Ithaca - Continued Discussion

Jim Tull reviewed the updated site plan.

Hickey and Curtis reviewed a list of what they feel is still missing from the site plan:

1. Revised traffic report to submit to Sear-Brown.
2. Trail and sidewalk in connection with Oakcrest indicated on site plan. Site plans should be labeled for proposed and existing parking spaces. The request is for 3,700 spaces but Hickey had requested another plan with the 20% reduction, or 3,500 parking spaces.
3. A post-construction topographical map. Cross added that this will also be required for the drainage plan. The drainage plan now has the calculations and pipe sizes but it isn't a complete plan with topographic grades and inverts and specific dimensions of the storm water pond.
4. Elevations at the appropriate scale.
5. Appropriate plantings in the detention pond to improve the water quality.
6. Need lighting plan with photometrics that will be sent to the Lighting Commission. The Board is particularly interested in the lighting plan for the west end that faces Shannon Park. The Board can approve the Special Permit without the lighting plan but will need it before a building permit can be issued. At this stage the Board is looking a general summary of the lighting plan - the heights and location of lights, and types of fixtures. The technical photometric type information will come later.
7. A construction schedule in three month phases so the Board has some idea of what will go on.
8. Pyramid Mall will be responsible for managing the traffic so it does not injure the roads or impede the traffic.
9. Cross said that the ring road has a turn in it rather than being continuous and should either be rounded or have a stop sign installed.

Hickey reported that Sears Brown did not feel that the Pyramid Mall traffic analysis done by Mr. Napoleon was adequate. They found it unacceptable and recommended a procedure for determining what the growth in traffic will be. So the Board needs a new traffic analysis done in accordance with those recommendations. Hickey asked Pyramid Mall to follow those recommendations and submit a revised report.

Someone has to make the determination if there needs to be further traffic mitigation on N. Triphammer Road or on the bridge. If it's on the bridge, the DOT has to tell the Village what the mitigation is and then it's up to Pyramid Mall to determine if they will do it or not. The first thing that needs to be done is to get an acceptable traffic report to Sear Brown.

Klepach expressed concern about additional traffic on the side roads and suggested that a consultant be asked to evaluate about what sorts of measures might mitigate the traffic that can be expected on Oakcrest Road and Dart Drive. Hickey said that we need to wait until we get the revised traffic report so we know what numbers to expect.

Reports

Trustees: Waterman reported the Mayor appointed John Bailey to replace Cliff Buck as Trustee. Bailey has been an alternate on the BZA and represented the Village in the NEST study. The appointment is effective immediately. There is a vacancy on the BZA as John Hartnett resigned effective in September. The Mayor is proposing Michael Ward with John Dennis as an alternate. That will bring the BZA up to full strength. He announced that the BZA would choose their own chairperson.

Regarding a meeting with the Mayor, Hickey and the DOT on the Triphammer Road reconstruction, Hickey said that the DOT was very receptive. They recognized our problems and we recognized their concern about that bridge. They wanted to redo the bridge as part of the reconstruction, but that would have made N. Triphammer Road a 5-lane road

like Elmira Road.

Planning Consultant Decision

Hickey said that they have now interviewed the three consulting firms and asked Board members for their reactions. Brown said that she wasn't entirely happy with any of them but would go with EDR. Halevy said that Trowbridge was too informal, and that the references for Saratoga said that they stay on schedule and on budget, but that their plan seemed a little off the shelf and not customized, and that the principal wasn't around after the contract was signed. He was impressed with Saratoga's preparation, but was uncertain about the amount of design experience they would have to offer compared to EDR. He thought that EDR was a good listener, and was cost conscious. References said that they are good at public participation, are community oriented, and produced a good product. Mr. Crandall was late for the first appointment, seemed unprepared for our questions and didn't check out the area prior to the interview. He still seemed confused during the second interview and would not discuss the budget but only referred to funds we had available. They hardly spoke about the Village at all. For those reasons, Halevy voted for Saratoga. Waterman agreed with Halevy in that the Saratoga people were very professional and that is her preference. However, she said that she is flexible on this decision. We might get a more creative product from Crandall. Klepack said that her decision is strongly influenced by the recommendations she received for EDR. People are excited about this firm. She couldn't find anybody with any complaints that would tend to confirm the Planning Board's concerns. EDR depends heavily on public participation. She said it also weighs heavily for her in looking at the projects that the two groups have done. Saratoga really deals more with planning issues and not design issues. EDR has worked on some very impressive places including the historic canal area in Pittsford. Bonnie Majestic was educated at Cornell and knows the area. Halevy said he is interested in picking the best firm and is not committed to choosing Saratoga. Klepack said that they are both available immediately and would like to use the time before Hickey leaves to get started.

Curtis said that he leaned toward EDR. He was mostly impressed by the fact that 90% of their projects have actually been implemented. He has seen a lot of plans that don't get done. The key to having a project implemented includes involving the people with a stake in the outcome. Our problems won't be addressed by a boiler plate solution.

The Board felt that comparing the two firms was like comparing apples and oranges. Klepack nominated EDR. Hickey seconded. All in favor. Hickey asked Klepack to continue to work with the consultant, and to notify the others of the Board's decision. The latter half of the November 8th agenda will be set aside as In-Service time to meet with them.

Halevy and Waterman both emphasized how grateful they were for all of Carol Klepack's hard work on this project. Waterman moved that the Board formally thank Carol and express their appreciation for the excellent, thorough job that she did. Brown Seconded. All in favor.

Minutes

September 21, 1999: Klepack moved that the 9/21/99 minutes be approved as amended. Seconded by Waterman. All in favor.

-

-

New Business

Klepack said that her neighborhood association met and discussed the possibility of bringing some pressure to bear on Audrey Edelman to connect up to the spur that Ivar Jonson has just constructed. There was concern, however, that their existing connection to Warren Road might be blocked. Klepack had told her neighbors that the whole point was to get dual access. The assurances the neighborhood has been given over the years that access to the road (owned by Integrated Acquisitions) will not be blocked has never been provided in writing. Klepack asked if the Board would ask them to provide a letter assuring that it would be maintained as an open road regardless whether another outlet is created .

Marcus pointed out, as he has in the past, that he could neither represent the Village nor the Edlemans on this matter because of a conflict of interest, but that he would try to answer general questions. He felt it would be more appropriate for the neighborhood association to make this request. Klepack responded that the Planning Board feels there should be dual access there and in that regard perhaps it should come from the Village. Marcus said that the Village could not require anything to happen or assurances be provided from the Colberts, but would have approval authority for the road to Ivar Jonson's development. The approval process for the rest of the road could require some grant of permission from the Colberts. The Village would certainly want dual sources of access. It would technically be an easement allowing property owners within the neighborhood the right to go across that property to get to Warren Road. Klepack said that she couldn't imagine the Village permitting a blockage of that road as a safety issue. Marcus said that the problem originated because the original subdivision plan for Audrey Edelman included the connection to Jonson's development and that was going to be the public road. The Village allowed permits to be issued for building houses without access to a public road. This needs to go on the agenda for another meeting.

Traffic calming will also be put on the agenda

Marcus distributed material with regard to signage issues for the Board to read.

Marcus said that on the November 8th agenda there may be something that the Board had seen a brief presentation on by George Gesslein regarding a subdivision at the end of Wakefield Drive. This is something that the Village has been wanting to do for a long time and the Village Engineer has been asking to get this moving along.

Finally, Marcus said that the Trustees had asked him to mention to the Board that it will at some point in the not distant future look at subdivision applications for the N. Triphammer Road rights-of-way acquisitions. These are little slivers of land that the Village has been acquiring for the N. Triphammer Road expansion and they will need subdivision approval.

Hickey said that the Trustees' first meeting in December will be a joint Planning Board/Trustee meeting.

Adjourn

Waterman moved to adjourn at 10:00 pm. Seconded by Klepack. All in favor.