

Town of Cazenovia Planning Board

Meeting Minutes

January 2, 2020

Members Present: Robert Ridler, Chairman; Anne Ferguson; Jerry Munger; Dale Bowers; Hugh Roszel; Bryan Wendel; Thomas Clarke; Gerald Rasmussen, Alternate Member; Jon Vanderhoef, Alternate Member

Members Absent:

Others Present: John Langey; Roger Cook; John Dunkle; Don Ferlow; James Benzing; Barbara Benzing; Matthew Vredenburgh; Andrew Majka; Lawrence Underriner; Don Ballway; Kenneth (Clay) Coleman; Tom Eisenhut; Jim Hagan; Thomas Pratt; Anne Redfern; Graham Egerton

R. Ridler called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by H. Roszel, to approve the December 5, 2019 meeting minutes was carried unanimously.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Thursday, February 6, 2020.

The next deadline day will be Wednesday, January 22, 2020.

The next regularly scheduled work session will be Thursday, January 30, 2020.

HEARINGS

*Benzing, James & Barbara – Minor (1) Subdivision – 2055 Rippleton Cross Road,
File # 19-1253 (Hugh Roszel) Cazenovia*

James Benzing was present to represent the file. He said his request was to create a 5-acre lot from the eastern section of his (58+ acre) land. The drawing entitled *Subdivision Map of Lands of James & Barbara Benzing (Rippleton Cross Road) Parts of Lots 42,43,49 & 50 Road Township Reservation Town of Cazenovia, Madison County, New York* created by David A. Vredenburg, dated 12-17-2019 was referenced. He said as was requested by the Board the location of the percolation test (perc test) was cited on the drawing. The Deep Hole tests were as well. He said 70 feet of road frontage along the eastern boundary has been retained to allow farmer access to the alfalfa field that lies in the northern part of the property.

H. Roszel asked if the newly created lot would have 250 feet of road frontage on Rippleton Cross Road.

J. Benzing answered, "Yes."

H. Roszel asked about the driveway location since it was not indicated on the drawing.

J. Benzing said it was marked on the property at the highest spot, referring to a letter the Highway Superintendent submitted to the file October 24, 2019 approving that location for adequate sight distance.

J. Langey read from the letter saying the driveway is only to be "approved near the east property line of 2081 Rippleton Cross Road." He advised an approval to be conditioned upon the marking of the driveway as per the Highway Superintendent's letter.

A. Ferguson asked that Mr. Benzing sketch the approximate location of the driveway and initial the drawing for the record.

T. Clarke asked if the Highway Superintendent could be asked to verify the actual location.

R. Cook said they could ask Mr. Slocum to do that, but he also reminded the Board that any building on the lot will require future site plan review.

J. Benzing said there will also be some drainage work that will need to be confirmed.

At this time R. Ridler asked if there was anyone present wishing to comment on the application, asking that the speakers identify themselves and address all remarks to the Board.

Hearing no comments, motion by H. Roszel, seconded by B. Wendel, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

Motion by H. Roszel, to approve the minor subdivision as most recently submitted with the driveway notation made this evening, seconded by B. Wendel, was carried unanimously.

*Cunningham, Phillip – Minor (4) Subdivision – 3500 Cobblestone Drive, Cazenovia
File # 19-1260 (Anne Ferguson) & Cobblestone Drive, Cazenovia*

Matthew Vredenburgh was present to represent the file.

A. Ferguson said they had heard from the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and that it was confirmed there would be no (archaeological) impact. She said the only outstanding item was an updated plat based upon comments from the last meeting.

M. Vredenburgh said the plat, a grading plan, and the conservation easement language were the items lacking.

J. Langey said he recently received the conservation easement language and if the Board was comfortable with the completion of his review as a condition of an approval, they could “move forward.”

A. Ferguson asked if Mr. Vredenburgh needed to bring anything to the Board’s attention with regard to the updated plat.

M. Vredenburgh said no grading plan was needed for the road since a road already exists. He said it would be widened to meet Town standards. He said perc tests were completed today and were witnessed by Mr. Cook. He said the findings were that conventional systems would be used for four (4) new lots, with three (3) of the four (4) having a shallow trench conventional system, and a raised bed system for the fifth lot.

The plat also shows the areas of disturbance for each lot, with the total being no more than five (5) accumulative acres, as requested by Mr. Dunkle. He said each lot would require site plan approval for development.

A. Ferguson asked if the Town must approve the private road becoming a Town road prior to development.

J. Langey answered that it would. He said the approval would be conditioned relative to the acceptance and inspection of the proposed public road.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by H. Roszel, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

R. Ridler asked if there was anyone wishing to comment reminding speakers to identify themselves by name and address and to address any questions to the Board.

Andrew Majka of 3912 Moseley Road asked if the residents of Moseley Road would have any assurances that there would not be any additional commercial traffic resulting from the proposal. He said many heavy construction vehicles come from Cobblestone Drive and if that were to increase it would reduce the residents' enjoyment as well as property values.

A. Ferguson said the intent of the development is residential, so other than during the construction period, she would not anticipate an increase. She invited Mr. Majka to come forward and view the drawing submitted this evening entitled *Cunningham Subdivision Cobblestone Drive, Town of Cazenovia, Madison County, NY P-100 Preliminary Plat* dated January 2, 2020 by MDVLA.

Mr. Majka was shown how some parts of the Rural B (RB) Zone will be constrained by the conservation easements.

M. Vredenburgh said Mr. Cunningham did not want any further commercial development.

R. Ridler said there was not increase in the potential for commercial activity based upon the application.

A. Majka believed there could be an increase in the density of the commercial activity in the locations where the RB zone is not constrained.

R. Ridler responded the RB zone areas were preexisting.

Lawrence Underminer of 3903 Nelson Heights Road said during the course of the last 5 – 6 years "Moseley Road has taken a beating" from the heavy commercial traffic. He said

during construction season drivers are trying to avoid tractor trailers and 50-ton construction vehicles. He said he was not opposing the development, but he was concerned about the condition of Moseley Road.

A. Ferguson said Mr. Underriner's comments have been noted.

Hearing no further comments, motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by H. Roszel, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by H. Roszel, to approve the subdivision as most recently proposed conditioned upon the conservation easement language to be reviewed and approved by the Attorney for the Town; conditioned upon a road construction agreement between the Town Board and the Developer, including reimbursement for any fees related to the engineering approvals of the design and inspections as well as any other fees incurred by the Town for the dedication of the road; and conditioned upon a partial Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for construction mitigation and for the overall site was carried unanimously.

LAND DISTURBANCE/SITE PLAN REVIEW/SUBDIVISION

*Crawford, Albert & Michelle – Site Plan Review –5039 East Lake Road, Cazenovia
File # 18-1192 (Robert Ridler)*

No one was present to represent the file.

R. Ridler said there is nothing new in the file, and the construction of the foundation and the structure is still underway.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by T. Clarke, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

*Graveling, Mark & Carol – Site Plan Review – 5092 Lakewood Way, Cazenovia
File # 19-1256 (Jerry Munger)*

No one was present to represent the file.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by A. Ferguson, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

Silverman, David -- Site Plan Review – 1030 & 1100 Marlyn Park Drive, Cazenovia
File # 19-1264 (Brian Wendel)

Matthew Vredenburgh was present to represent the file.

B. Wendel displayed three (3) photographs showing the property at 1030 Marlyn Park Drive which was recently purchased by Mr. Silverman.

M. Vredenburgh said he understands Mr. Silverman plans to remove a perforated pipe and replace it with a solid pipe.

B. Wendel explained the plan shows a French drain but Mr. Silverman is unsure as to whether that is actually installed in the area where it is shown.

M. Vredenburgh showed on a schematic drawing submitted with the application where there are a series of catch basins, saying Mr. Silverman is endeavoring to drain the lawn area.

J. Munger asked if the drainage currently goes directly into the lake.

M. Vredenburgh said it appears to.

J. Dunkle said he was asked to review the drainage plan earlier in the week but was reluctant to visit the site while Mr. Silverman was out of town. He expressed his desire to visit the site with Mr. Cook saying conceptually the plan sounds reasonable. He said he did not want to delay the Board's decision so if they would like to condition a decision based upon his and Mr. Cook's further review, that was an option.

A. Ferguson said she would like the Applicant to return (before making a decision).

B. Wendel and M. Vredenburgh said they did not think Mr. Silverman was in a "rush."

J. Langey asked Mr. Vredenburgh if he could send Mr. Dunkle an email authorizing Mr. Dunkle to visit the property with Mr. Silverman's authorization.

M. Vredenburgh said he would.

J. Dunkle said he would prefer to visit the site with Mr. Silverman present as well.

M. Vredenburgh said he would make the arrangements.

Motion by B. Wendel, seconded by J. Munger, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

Caz Carwash, LLC -- ZBA Recommendation – 2567 Route 20 East, Cazenovia
File # 19-1242 (Dale Bowers)

Don Ballway was present to represent the file accompanied by Jim Hagan of Hagan Architects P.C. Kenneth (Clay) Coleman and Tim Eisenhut were present in the audience as well.

D. Bowers explained that the Applicants are before the Planning Board because the Cazenovia Town Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) has asked the Board to do a site plan review recommendation for the file. In addition to the site plan review, the Board has also been asked to collect information from John Dunkle, the Engineer for the Town, from Jim Cunningham, the Water Pollution Control Facility Operator, and from the Cazenovia Advisory Conservation Commission (CACC) to be incorporated into the site plan review.

J. Hagan distributed copies of a packet of drawings created by his firm;

- 1) *Cazenovia Carwash View 1*
- 2) *Cazenovia Carwash View 2*
- 3) *Cazenovia Carwash A-1 Proposed Site Plan*
- 4) *Cazenovia Carwash A-2 Proposed Floor Plan and Elevations*
- 5) *Cazenovia Carwash A-3 Site Details.*

J. Dunkle asked if these are the drawings he has seen.

J. Hagan said they are.

J. Hagan explained that Mr. Ballway, Mr. Coleman, and Mr. Eisenhut have contracted to purchase property on the north side of US Route 20, close to the Town line. He said it is 2.82 acres with 300 feet of road frontage on Route 20. He described it as a trapezoid-shaped piece of land with 300 feet on the east side and 450 feet on the west side. He said the property is directly opposite a turn-through lane on Route 20. Currently the site is vacant but there is a gravel driveway with an existing culvert beneath the driveway. They are proposing a one-story, 2800 square foot building located in the center of the site. There would be two (2) touchless, automatic bays to the north, and two (2) self-serve, wand-wash bays closer to Route 20. In the center of the building would be the mechanical room with storage as well as a pet-wash area on the west side of the center area. They propose a one-entrance driveway from Route 20. He said they have had preliminary discussion with the New York State Department of Transportation (DOT)

about the driveway location but the DOT has not completed the review. He said a drainage report has also been submitted to the DOT. The driveway would be a divided access road with drivers entering and then turning right, headed counterclockwise around the driveway which would divide into four (4) lanes for the bays. There would be excess room for 20 cars stacking, in excess of five (5) cars per bay. Customers would then exit to the west of the building and out the same driveway they entered. Also, along the west exit would be four (4) vacuum stations. Two (2) parking spaces would be provided for the pet-washing area as well. Behind the building would be a by-pass driveway for those not wishing to wait, as well as for deliveries and fire service. They have had discussion with Mr. Dunkle and one thing he requested was that fire department review the fire vehicle access. He did not believe the fire department has had a chance to do that at this time. He said in addition to the paved area there will be gravel (which he believed to be permeable surface area) to accommodate larger emergency vehicles. He said the building is setback from the street line 152 feet; 100 feet from the east property line, 155 feet from the west property line, and approximately 150 feet from the north property line. The building itself would cover 2 ½ % of the site area. They are at 19.97% hard-surface area.

A. Ferguson pointed out the gravel area would be considered impervious surface area as well, so some adjustment will need to be done to keep it under the 20% requirement.

J. Hagan continued by saying the rear of the site would remain undeveloped. He said the site is fairly level, with some sloping from the northeast corner to the southwest corner. There is a natural depression in the southwest corner that currently exists. The elevation of the building would be 65' and the elevation of Route 20 is 64'. A biofilter area was proposed in the front of the building, but after conversation with Mr. Dunkle, more engineering will be developed. A grassy swale and a dry swale are proposed behind the building. A storm water wetland was proposed to replace the original plan for a dry storm water basin and those details will be elaborated. A discharge structure/ditch is also being developed for peak times (of discharge) along Route 20. The site will be served with public water and public sewer. Details are being worked out in conjunction with both those services, and the Applicants know they have to address the technical issues primarily with the sewer service. Because there had been structures on the site previously, there is not a lot of vegetation in the immediate area of the site. There is an existing, established tree line on the north and east sides of the property. They plan to install new deciduous trees in the front and wrapping around the west side of the site. In the area directly west of the building they are proposing a cluster of evergreens. Around the immediate building they propose decorative landscaping. They are also proposing a free-standing sign at the entrance to the site. Because of the tree line along the east boundary, they feel the entrance to the car wash needs to be indicated. Depending on the final storm water design, they anticipate additional plantings as well. He said they propose four (4) pole lights. A photometric plan has not been completed at this time. He distributed some information regarding the LED fixtures they are considering which would be downlighted on the pole.

R. Ridler asked the height of the pole.

J. Hagan answered 20 feet. He said on the west side of the building there would also be three (3) wall-mounted fixtures which will be downlights, for the immediate area on the exit side of the building.

J. Dunkle asked if those lights would be shielded.

J. Hagan said that would be part of the design of the fixture, saying with LED lights one can use a “cut off” to direct the light. He said it would not be a fixture mounted on the building as a spotlight shining outwardly. It is their intent that they would comply with dark-sky requirements. He then talked about the drawing showing the 3-dimensional view of the building. He described the building as 1-story with a tipped roof design broken into multiple sections and having gable vents. The roof surface would be an architectural shingle in a brown shade. The mass of the building would be a clapboard siding of fiber cement, also in a brown shade and with brown trim. The lower portion of the building would be a decorative masonry, and he showed the Board a sample of the material.

T. Clarke asked if the building would have gutters.

J. Hagan said it would.

J. Hagan said the decorative masonry material comes in an 8” X 16” block which is textured but not split-faced. It would be four (4) feet high on the building. There would be a sill detail to transition from the masonry to the clapboard.

A. Ferguson asked if the material comes in the shape of cement blocks.

J. Hagan said it does, commenting that it is much costlier than cement blocks.

J. Hagan said the doors going into the bays will be glass doors, mechanically operated.

R. Ridler asked about the window panes of the wash bay doors, wondering if they would be plastic or glass.

They would be clear polycarbonate.

J. Hagan said also in the packet the Board would find site details and the floor plan of the building.

D. Bowers verified the Applicants have received Jim Cunningham’s comments.

J. Hagan said they have.

D. Bowers asked if Mr. Dunkle had any comments, saying the Board realizes he has made various comments via email, and some of the details are still being developed.

J. Dunkle said to summarize his review thus far, the site access and circulation provides a safe environment for people to get off Route 20 with ample stacking space. He does want the fire department to review the access around the building (for their equipment). He is in general agreement with the overall concept of the storm water management as it has been presented. There are some details to work out on the actual plantings and expression of the final storm water detention, but he supports the overall concept. He said he would like to see the water usage numbers to ensure there will be no problems with that. He would also like to see the lighting plan and photometrics. He would continue to review these main items as the project moves forward, including a final grading plan.

D. Bowers asked if Mr. Hagan was clear on what the Engineer for the Town is seeking.

J. Hagan said he is and that there is a grading plan.

R. Ridler said the Board and he are concerned about the impact of the operation as one enters the Village which makes the comments of the CACC relevant.

D. Ferlow said the members of the CACC's review of the proposal was fairly extensive. They were asked to primarily review the planting plan, which he described as "simple." He said a row of evergreens, four deciduous trees in the front, and a small foundation planting were the components of the plan. He said four (4) different land use characters are proposed on the site: bituminous pavement, concrete pavement, permeable stone, and lawn. He said the lawn area was 2 acres. They questioned the maintenance of such a large lawn area, feeling a meadow habitat next to an area of mown lawn would be more practical and in keeping with the natural surroundings.

J. Hagan interjected that the suggestion was their intent, though it may not have been clear on the plan.

D. Ferlow continued by saying it should be mowed once after bird nesting in the spring, and once in the fall. He said the spruce trees proposed should do fairly well in the soils found on the site. He asked why plant them in a row.

J. Hagan considered the planting to be more of a cluster, and said they were proposed as such to partially mitigate the exit side of the building.

D. Ferlow responded that was acceptable, he was just curious about the rationale. He said the choice for the four honeylocust trees has been used a lot in the recent

development along Route 20. He said they are a good, acceptable tree, but felt the addition of oaks would improve the front screen scape. He said regarding the three (3) species of bushes, ninebark is large, grow-low sumac is a groundcover, and taxus baccata becomes a 60' tree and some varieties are not hardy in our area. He said the bushes would be crowded to the foundation wall. He felt planting further from the foundation would allow better growth without having to trim them.

J. Hagan said the bioretention area will affect the plant location.

D. Ferlow suggested more evergreens be added along Route 20 to help soften the commercial visual impact along the designated scenic byway. He thought the inclusion of oaks as well as the idea of the meadow, and the plantings that will be included in the wetland/bioretention area will all contribute to the softening of the visual impact.

J. Hagan said he would be happy to work with the CACC about this but asked that the front of the property be considered closely because people seeking to use the facility will want to see how many customers may already be in line.

D. Ferlow said the CACC also looked at the proposed grading. Along the eastern side adjacent to the pavement, they thought a swale should be in mind because water would come onto the site and would potentially run onto the pavement, across the pavement, and then into the bioretention area as the grading currently is proposed. They also recommended a 2% minimum cross pitch on the pavement for water movement. He believed Mr. Dunkle had spoken to the Applicants about the stormwater pond, but pointed out a 2-foot pond, even with gravelly soil, will not be fully dry, so he felt going with a wetland would be better, mentioning mosquito problems. He said a few other minor details are included in the report as well, which will need to be coordinated with drainage and other features. He said the engineering member of the Commission, Damian Vanetti, raised some other issues relative to water quality which should be addressed as well.

D. Bowers said the comments will be forwarded to the Applicants for their response. He encouraged the Applicants to work with the CACC if they have any questions. He said the four (4) sources of the technical details involve the CACC, Mr. Dunkle, Mr. Cunningham, and the Board. He asked if the Board had questions at this time.

R. Ridler repeated the concern regarding the visual impact of the proposal. He understands the need for the business to be seen to attract customers, but the location along the corridor as the entryway into the Village must be considered. He said he would like to see more screening and attention to mitigating the commercial visual impact of the application.

D. Bowers remarked the Applicants cannot hide the fact that the business is a car wash.

A. Ferguson agreed that more evergreen plantings in the front would improve the appearance. She said an entrance sign would advertise the business without it having to be starkly visible. She said it is important to understand this is a scenic byway, so they want to ensure they do not turn “a beautiful meadow into asphalt.” She felt looking to see the number of cars in line at the car wash was unsafe along this stretch of road where people are driving 55 mph.

H. Roszel asked where the gutters on the building would drain.

J. Hagan said the gutters on the front sides would drain into the biofilter area and the gutters on the back area would drain into a grassy swale.

B. Wendel and J. Dunkle asked about the sign appearance and location.

J. Hagan said the sign would be in a landscaped bed, but the design has not been finalized. He said on the building, facing Route 20, there would also be a sign identifying the car wash. He said there would also be a sign on the west side of the building identifying the pet wash. He said they anticipate the need for low, close to the ground, directional signs showing customers where to go to proceed through the bays as well.

J. Munger said he and Mr. Clarke visited the site with Mr. Coleman and Mr. Ballway. He said there is a corn field to the east of the site, beyond the heavily wooded tree line, and they were wondering who owns that property. He felt westbound traffic would have trouble knowing the car wash was there because it is so heavily screened and thought less screening along that edge would be better. He felt the most visibility would be from traffic heading east leaving town.

B. Wendel asked if the Applicants could have a 2-sided sign perpendicular to the road.

They can.

B. Wendel said he would suggest a perpendicular sign, thinking signs parallel to the road would not be effective.

J. Hagan said the perpendicular sign was their intent, believing the size would be critical given the speeds along Route 20.

D. Ballway said speaking to the mowed area, they were envisioning mowing tight to the pavement, saying they would leave the early successional scrub and leaving the vegetation much as it exists except for the area disturbed for the storm water.

T. Clarke asked if all the discharge would go through the oil separator.

D. Ballway said there would be a sand removal device in each bay which would common to the oil water separator.

A. Ferguson asked if the operation plan is to be open 24 hours a day, seven (7) days a week.

D. Ballway affirmed it would be, saying it would be an unmanned facility and typically this type of facility is (open those hours). He said there is enough business at night that makes it worthwhile to be open.

A. Ferguson asked if the reason for the 20' poles is because the facility would be unstaffed. She said she was concerned about (the impact of lighting upon the) neighbors.

J Hagan said they could propose lower pole lights, but that would require more poles to adequately light the site. He said the question was whether they would rather have a limited number of poles or have more light sources. He felt a 20' pole was not an unreasonable height. He showed on the drawing where the lights are proposed.

J. Munger asked the height of the building.

J. Hagan answered 12' to the eave and 20' to the peak.

A. Ferguson asked about the amount of business generated between 11:00 p.m – 5:00 a.m. as it pertains to the need for night lighting.

J. Hagan said people working night shifts would use the car wash during those hours. He said another consideration is that cash is kept on site from customers paying by cash, so lighting is a deterrent for theft as well.

A. Ferguson asked how emergencies would be handled (at the unmanned site).

D. Ballway said emergency numbers would be displayed.

J. Hagan said each bay would also have a code to exit the bay if needed.

T. Eisenhut elaborated about the emergency exit box located in the bays. He said if someone had a cell phone the emergency number is on the walls in bright red and help would arrive in 5 – 10 minutes.

T. Clarke asked if there was generator.

J. Hagan said there was not.

T. Eisenhut believed any emergencies that would arise would be similar to emergencies “that could happen to people without a cell phone anywhere.”

A. Ferguson agreed wondering the need to be open at 3:00 a.m.

T. Eisenhut repeated that the night workers at the nearby factories would wash at night rather than during the day.

A. Ferguson asked about the maximum amount of impervious surface area allowed for the project.

D. Bowers answered 20% was allowed.

T. Clarke said the proposal is a little over 19% as currently calculated.

It was repeated that the calculations would need to reflect that any gravel area would be considered impervious.

J. Hagan said they would make that slight adjustment.

D. Bowers believed the Applicants would be able to meet the qualifications necessary for the impervious surface allowance. He asked if the Applicants are clear about what they need to address in regard to the other three (3) major aspects of the project. He said once that is all “put together” the Board will then have comments of their own as well, some of which they have already heard this evening.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by B. Wendel, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

J. Langey added the Applicants will most likely have to do a stormwater maintenance agreement.

J. Hagan said the was fine. Although it is a private facility, he understood the concern.

J. Langey explained it would be a recordable instrument saying the Owner of the property is continuously responsible for mowing and taking care of the stormwater management practices on the project, based upon the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) model the Town has used before. He wanted Mr. Hagan to let his clients know about this stipulation and cost,

AMD Creative Glamping (Luca Trails, LLC) -- Site Plan Review – Route 20 East
File # 19-1267 (Thomas Clarke) Cazenovia

No one was present to represent the file.

T. Clarke said the Applicants would be appearing before the ZBA January 21, 2020.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by H. Roszel, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by B. Wendel, to adjourn the meeting was carried unanimously at 8:34 P.M.

Sue Wightman, Planning Board Secretary
January 3, 2020