

Town of Cazenovia Planning Board

Meeting Minutes

March 4, 2021

ZOOM video <https://madisoncounty-ny.zoom.us/j/98161367303>

Meeting ID: 981 6136 7303

Or Dial by phone (no video)

+1 646-558-8656 US (New York)

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

Members Absent: Bryan Wendel

Others Present: John Langey; John Dunkle; Don Ferlow; Roger Cook; Joseph Raquepas; Jennifer Basic; Joseph Basic; Matthew Vredenburg; Jeff Davis; Nate Hickey; Peter Dononhoe; Grazi Zazzara; Anthony DiPeso; James Knittel; Michael Stanczyk ; Michael Borkowski; Whitney Hughes; Daniel Manning; Caleb Sayers; Bernard Brown; Brian Manning; Leslie Tuttle-Ditrani; Eric Beyer; Allen Olmsted; Bryan Stocks; Kathy & Rick Stoeckel; Kyle Reger; Kristi Anderson; Jenn Wong; Pam Ryan; Kim Mitchell; Mark Franklin; Gerald Melbaum; Brian Enders; Nathan Bliss; David Eilers; Andrew Wright; Al Brandolini; Patricia Carmelli (Ava C).

Town of Cazenovia – Planning Board – Meeting Minutes – March 4, 2021

R. Ridler called the meeting to order at 7:34 P.M. (He had to wait for the Planning Board Secretary to allow all participants to join the meeting.) He read the following announcements:

“Welcome to the March 4, 2021 Meeting of the Town of Cazenovia Planning Board, which has been legally noticed in the *Cazenovia Republican*, on the Town Website and outside the Town Offices.

This meeting is a virtual meeting as authorized by New York Executive Order 202.1.

This meeting is being recorded and will be made available on the Town’s website.

The public may be participating. When public speaking is allowed, speakers are asked to please state their name and address for the audio recording. Otherwise, the public is asked to remain silent during the proceedings.

Attendance will be taken, and votes will be conducted by roll call.

When possible, the Board members and applicants will be named while speaking for audio recording purposes.

Please note: The output of transcribing from an audio/video recording from Zoom, will be fairly accurate, although in some cases will be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting. If you should need clarification for something said, please contact the Planning Board Secretary.”

Attendance was taken by roll call. All were present except for Bryan Wendel. Gerald Rasmussen was asked to assume the position of a voting member in Mr. Wendel’s absence.

Motion by H. Roszel, seconded by T. Clarke, to approve the February 4, 2021 Zoom meeting minutes was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes

Robert Ridler Voted Yes.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Wednesday, March 31, 2021.

The next deadline day will be Wednesday, March 17, 2021.

The next regularly scheduled work session will be Thursday, March 25, 2021.

(The April regular meeting was changed from Thursday April 1, 2021 to Wednesday, March 31, 2021 due to the Easter holiday.)

HEARINGS

*Raquepas, Joseph & Maria -- Line Change – 3818 Number Nine Road &
with Poglitsch, William & Melonie Number Nine Road, Cazenovia
File # 21-1332 (Hugh Roszel)*

Joseph Raquepas was present to represent the file.

H. Roszel said the application was for a simple line change.

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

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

H. Roszel asked if there was anyone wishing to speak at this time.

Town of Cazenovia – Planning Board – Meeting Minutes – March 4, 2021

Hearing no one, motion by H. Roszel, seconded by A. Ferguson, to close the public hearing was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

Motion by H. Roszel, seconded by T. Clarke, to approve the line change as most recently submitted was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

*Basic, Jennifer & Joseph -- Line Change – 3842 Charles Road &
File # 21-1333 (Bryan Wendel) Charles Road, Cazenovia*

Jennifer and Joseph Basic were present to represent the file.

Jen Basic explained they have two (2) contiguous lots. One was a farm lot having about 32 acres and the other was their house having approximately five (5) acres. They built a football field which straddles both lots. They would like to adjust the lot line so that the football field will be entirely on the home lot.

Motion by R. Ridler, seconded by A. Ferguson, to open the public hearing was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes

Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

R. Ridler asked if there was any one present wishing to comment.

Hearing no one, motion by D. Bowers, seconded by A. Ferguson, to close the public hearing was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by H. Roszel, to approve the line change as most recently submitted was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

LAND DISTURBANCE/SITE PLAN REVIEW/SUBDIVISION

*33 Rippleton, LLC/Meiers Creek -- Site Plan Review – 4025 NYS Route 13 South,
File # 20-1313 (Thomas Clarke) Cazenovia*

Jeff Davis was present to represent the file.

T. Clarke said they were still awaiting an archeological study and the weather will dictate when that can be done.

R. Ridler said a question regarding the allowable amount of impervious surface area had arisen since a portion of the lot is within the Lake Watershed Overlay Zone. He believed according to 107-7.1C section of the Town Code, 500 feet or farther from the lake permitted 20% of coverage. He asked Roger Cook, the Code Enforcement Officer if that was correct.

R. Cook affirmed that was correct.

R. Ridler believed the Applicant calculated the overall impervious coverage would be 19.1%.

T. Clarke said that was correct.

J. Davis said the information was correct and the study requested by SHPO was still in the works.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by A. Ferguson, to continue the file was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

*Donohoe, Peter -- Site Plan Review – 4895 East Lake Road, Cazenovia
File # 20-1323 (Jerry Munger)*

Matthew Vredenburgh of MDVLA was present to represent the file and Peter Donohoe was in attendance.

J. Munger said they had received new plans and new drawings and asked Mr. Vredenburgh to explain them.

M. Vredenburg said Mr. Dononhoe wanted to build a new house and originally wanted to put it on the existing footprint. They had to apply for area variances from the Cazenovia Town Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) and that Board recommended the structure be located farther from the lake. They changed the proposal to accommodate that request and were given approvals for the new location.

A. Ferguson asked the area variance sought.

M. Vredenburg said one variance was for building within 100 feet of the lake, even though the structure was moved farther from the lake, and another variance was for 6 ½ feet of north side yard setback relief. The new structure would be 18 ½ feet from the north property line.

J. Munger asked Mr. Vredenburg to talk about impervious surface coverages.

M. Vredenburg said moving the house away from the lake removed a great deal of impervious surface coverage in the first 20 feet of the lake but resulted in an unavoidable increase in the second zone. He said the existing coverage in Zone A was 35.2% and the proposal was for 4.2%. Zone B grew from 25.4% to 33.5%. Zone C would be unchanged.

R. Ridler asked if that (impervious percentage in Zone C) was 10.3%.

M. Vredenburg affirmed it was. He said the ZBA asked that there be no increase in impervious surface area. He said the existing was 15.7% and they have proposed 15.7%.

D. Bowers asked how they were able to keep the impervious surface area from increasing.

M. Vredenburg answered moving the house away from the lake shortened the driveway.

D. Bowers asked if they would widen the driveway.

M. Vredenburg said there was a large parking area to the right as well.

D. Bowers said he saw where the bridge would be reconstructed. He said the driveway would need to be enlarged to accommodate construction vehicles.

M. Vredenburg said the bridge was currently 12 feet wide.

D. Bowers said he drove over the bridge to visit the site. He asked if there was a plan to make the bridge wider.

M. Vredenburgh said they do plan to make it wider. He said the bridge is 12 feet wide with railings 9 feet from edge to edge. The railings will be pushed out to the 12-foot width and the bridge would need to be rebuilt to accommodate the concrete truck.

D. Bowers asked if that was included in his calculations.

M. Vredenburgh said it was.

A. Ferguson said the Owners indicated they want to keep the existing accessory structure and she wondered if the removal of it would be considered since the impervious surface coverage was so high in Zone B (33.5%).

M. Vredenburgh responded the barn was actually in Zone C.

T. Clarke asked the height of the proposed structure.

M. Vredenburgh answered 33.8 feet.

It was clarified the barn being discussed was located before the bridge to the right.

R. Ridler asked the distance between the proposed structure and the stream which is spanned by the bridge.

M. Vredenburgh calculated it to be approximately 70 feet. He said the new septic system would be located in that area.

D. Bowers asked if that (septic system) would be an alternative system.

M. Vredenburgh answered yes, saying it would most likely be a sand filter (system).

D. Bowers asked if there was ample room for that system.

M. Vredenburgh affirmed there was.

T. Clarke asked if it was a classified stream.

M. Vredenburgh answered it was a class A stream.

R. Ridler asked if two (2) large pine trees on site would be preserved.

M. Vredenburgh assured the Board they would endeavor to keep any trees they can. They said the only trees that may be impacted would be two (2) cedars that have grown under the foundation of the existing house. There were no plans to remove any other trees.

J. Munger noticed additional screening was proposed especially along the north side of the house.

M. Vredenburgh said that was correct. He explained to gain the side yard setback relief, they proposed to fill the space between the new structure and the property line with arborvitae and pine, to provide a double staggered row as a visual barrier from the ground level up. Currently there was a large cedar there which would remain as well as some pines along the western edge of the property line which only provide a higher visual buffer, so more arborvitae and pine would be installed.

H. Roszel asked how much of the existing concrete wall would remain along the water line.

M. Vredenburgh said they intend to leave it where it is. Although there was no use for it once the house will be relocated, because it currently supports the existing house, but he did not know how they would remove part of a poured concrete wall aesthetically. He said removing it entirely would require excavating into the lake which he felt was unadvisable. He said the back side of the wall would be backfilled with soil and they plan to plant behind it adhering to the shoreline development *Guidelines*.

R. Ridler asked if the split-rail fence along the property line was on the property line.

M. Vredenburgh said it was on the property line on the north side.

R. Ridler asked about screening for the new structure.

M. Vredenburgh repeated there would be arborvitae and pine between the new house and the Stoeckels'.

R. Ridler asked about screening from the lake side.

M. Vredenburgh said the northern third of the property has vegetation and vegetation would be added along the shoreline using the *Lakefront Development Guidelines*.

D. Bowers commented that the house, due to the proposed size was out of place in the little neighborhood. He felt it should have remained similar in size to what exists or perhaps a split level whereas the proposal has three stories at some levels. He said it would be "a huge house." He said he would probably push back some regarding the 35 %.

A. Ferguson agreed saying she was concerned about the size as well and felt the scale was too big.

M. Vredenburg elaborated that the footprint of the proposed house would be 1577 square feet. The footprint of the existing house was 1437 square feet including the covered porch. The garage adds 600 square feet. He said the living space would not be considerably different.

D. Bowers assumed there would living space above the garage.

M. Vredenburg responded that “it looked like it, yes.”

D. Bowers said many of the houses along East Lake Road in that area appear to be single-level homes from the road, saying that “was nice, they just settled in there.” He said this house would not.

A. Ferguson commented, “There is something to be said about keeping the character of the neighborhood.”

H Roszel asked about the appearance of the house, wondering if it would be cedar shake siding, or what the siding would be.

A. Ferguson asked Mr. Vredenburg to share his screen and show the site plan with photographs. She said what exists resembles an old fishing camp, calling it “a nice, old rustic structure.”

D. Bowers agreed it was a camp.

M. Vredenburg displayed the hand-drawn sketch of the proposal entitled *Donohoe Residence 4895 East Lake Road Mr. Peter Donohoe and Ms. Pam Ryan March 3, 2021.*

D. Bowers said the top drawing was the view from the road and the bottom view was the view from the lake.

M. Vredenburg also displayed the drawing he created entitled *Donohoe Residence Site Plan – Town of Cazenovia Planning Board L-301* dated February 22, 2021.

D. Bowers said he understood something needs to be done to the structure. He stressed the proposed structure would be very different from what exists. He repeated it would be much bigger than what was there.

H Roszel asked Mr. Vredenburg if he had an overly showing the existing and the proposed.

M. Vredenburg displayed his drawing entitled *Donohoe Residence Overall Site Plan – Town of Cazenovia Planning Board L-300 Dated February 23, 2021.*

H. Roszel asked the height of the existing house.

M. Vredenburg was unsure.

D. Bowers thought it was 1½ stories.

R. Ridler had some questions about the roofline and the lower section of the house viewed from the lake in the southern corner.

M. Vredenburg explained the lower section was a walk-out basement.

Returning to the topic of height, D. Bowers estimated the existing structure was less than 20 feet high.

M. Vredenburg explained the measurement of 33 feet was calculated from the lake side. He reasoned the existing house would be measured similarly and would measure taller than it appears from the east as well.

A. Ferguson asked about the houses nearby.

D. Bowers answered the house to the north, buffered by trees was a full two-story house, but other houses in the “hamlet” were split-level, appearing to be one story when driving by.

A. Ferguson asked if there was any receptivity on the part of the Applicants to design something more in harmony with the neighborhood.

M. Vredenburg did not believe there had been a request asking them to do so previously.

D. Bowers said they have been given a variance to build where they propose, so the only item the Planning Board can oversee was the increase (of impervious surface area) in Zone B to 35%.

J. Langey advised the Board to take some time to review the standards for site plan review. He said the Board was hearing information for the first time this evening, and they were not required to render a decision this evening. He said correspondence has been received regarding the project and the Board could take some time to educate themselves with the neighborhood. He asked if the Board was familiar with the neighborhood as Mr. Bowers described it.

Members indicated they were.

J. Langey said his point was that the Board could further deliberate. They could meet with the Applicants and their design professional to continue discussion at the next work session. He said, however, he was not suggesting that the Board could not vote regarding the proposal this evening if they were so inclined. The Board could do that as well.

J. Munger asked if the feeling of the Board was to continue this file.

D. Bowers and A. Ferguson said they would like to continue.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by D. Bowers, to continue the file was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

J. Langey asked Mr. Ridler to remind everyone when the next work session was scheduled.

R. Ridler said the date of the next work session was Thursday, March 25, 2021 at 7:30 PM.

J. Langey thought continuing the discussion at the next work session would benefit everyone.

*One Remington Cazenovia, LLC -- Site Plan Review – 1 Remington Drive,
(Current Owner One Remington, LLC)
File # 20-1328 (Robert Ridler)*

Anthony (TJ) DiPeso, Grazi Zazzara Jr. of ICON Companies, and James Knittel of In-Architects, PLLC and Michael Stanczyk of Lynn D'Elia Temes & Stanczyk were present to represent the file.

R. Ridler asked Mr. Knittel to review the architectural plans.

A. Ferguson asked Mr. Knittel to split his screen to share the site plan drawing.

J. Knittel displayed his drawing entitled *1 Remington Drive Residential Conversion 1 Remington Park Drive, Cazenovia, New York A-100 Existing Site Plan dated 12/15/2020*. He stated the existing building footprint was not being altered. The only improvements they were contemplating were additional sidewalk installation along the northwest side of the building and ten (10) additional parking spaces. The total number of parking spaces would then be 157, which he said would obviously be more than they would actually need. He said the reason for the increased spaces would be to provide accessibility to the upper-level units in that area (the northeastern side). He said the drawing was not updated to show where the dumpster was located and where they would continue to locate it in the northeastern corner where an enclosure was already provided.

J. Knittel said they were not contemplating any other changes to the existing site requiring zoning requirements. Everything already met those requirements. He said the impervious surface area did exceed the maximum allowance, but the additional sidewalk and parking only increased it by approximately 1 ½ %. He thought at some point in the future the Owners were considering removing some of the excess parking area in the north lot if impervious surface coverage was an issue.

J. Knittel then displayed his photograph entitled *1 Remington Park Drive Residential Conversion 1 Remington Park Drive, Cazenovia, New York A101 Existing Landscape dated 12/15/2020*. He said this was a drone shot showing the existing landscaping in place, which he described as being “very park-like.” He said the intention was to prune and maintain what has grown up since the property was maintained by GHD. They would perform seasonal pruning, cleaning, and maintenance of the site, saying what exists as far as landscaping was “quite nice,” with the building sitting quite a bit back from the road making it “very park-like now.”

T. Clarke asked if there would be screening on the Marquardt side of the building.

J. Knittel responded there was no screening intended. He said that corner sits rather low and there was existing growth along the parameter of that corner. He thought the units along the back were in a “well-protected, well-screened site on its own.”

T. Clarke asked if there would lighting around the looped, circular driveway.

J. Knittel said currently there was minimal lighting on the site. He said lighting exists around the perimeter of the drive and on the back of the building lighting the parking field. He said the lighting over the entrances would be located in the soffits on the building. He stated lighting would be sufficient for the residents and for safety, but not harsh as many parking lots tend to be.

R. Ridler asked if lighting would be night-sky compliant.

J. Knittel answered they would be, adding that many fixtures were dated, and any new fixture being replaced in-kind would be night-sky compliant.

A. Ferguson asked how many lights were to be installed and replaced.

J. Knittel replied that five (5) lights ring the circular drive, there were 3 – 4 lights at the front of the building, three (3) lights light the parking lot, and a coupe under soffit lights are over the entrance to the left of the main entrance. They would add one small, under soffit light at each entrance.

R. Ridler asked if the driveway that loops around was a one-way driveway.

J. Knittel said it was wide enough for two-way, but he was unsure if it was adequately sized for two (2).

A. Ferguson said in the documentation there was mention of having 28 units but in other places she saw mention of 30 units. She asked confirmation for the number of units being proposed.

Referring to *Sheet A1 entitled One Remington Park Drive Residential Conversion 1 Remington Park Lower Floor Plan and Sheet A2 Upper Floor Plan*, J. Knittel answered that there would be 13 plus three (3) totaling 16 units on the first level and on the upper level there would be three (3) and eight (8) totaling 11 units so the combined units would be 27.

A. Ferguson asked if calculations were based upon 27, 28 or 30 units.

J. Knittel answered parking was based upon 27 units, although the number of spaces far exceeded the number.

A. Ferguson asked about water calculations.

J. Knittel answered water calculations were based upon 28 – 30 units.

A. Ferguson encouraged the Applicants to remove some of the excess parking. She said if an application was reviewed by the Board for a new apartment complex, she doubted that a plan having 157 spaces for 27 units would be approved. She said she would like to see an indication that they would like to do something to make the site look less like a former corporate campus and more amenable to the tenants.

A. Ferguson said she would also like to see some plantings as Mr. Clarke implied between the building and the neighboring factory parking lot.

Regarding the modification to the front, A. Ferguson asked if there was sufficient room for moving vans. She elaborated that she presumed the front of the building was where people would be moving their belongings.

J. Knittel said for access to the lower levels, moving vans would park at either of the entrances to the side of the main entrance and utilize the proposed sidewalk if needed. He said upper units would be loaded or unloaded from the front entrance.

R. Ridler presumed there was adequate room for hand trucks as well.

J. Knittel affirmed there would.

A. Ferguson said she would also like to see that no long-term parking of trucks would be allowed in the parking lot.

R. Ridler asked if the Town has ordinances about that.

R. Cook answered, "Yes."

A. Ferguson asked if they have addressed any of the recommendations made by Madison County in terms of pedestrian accesses, access roads to the factory or the daycare center to avoid people having to enter Route 20.

J. Knittel responded that they have not made any provisions for that. He said other than going to Marquardt, after one leaves their site there was no good access and they would not encourage people to walk on Route 20.

A. Ferguson said that was the point of the recommendation.

A. Ferguson asked if the windows open, thinking being a corporate building the windows would be permanently sealed.

J. Knittel said they were sealed and as they finalize the layouts and locations, they would address replacing some of the windows. Doors will also need to be added as well as operable windows.

R. Cook said that issue would fall under the building code requirement for natural ventilation.

A. Ferguson asked if there would be any exterior patios.

J. Knittel responded that there would be not exterior patios. He explained that they would redevelop the courtyard and the units on the ground floor would have access to

the courtyard. The patio area would be within the internal courtyard. There would be nothing from the exterior of the building.

A. Ferguson said the reason for her level of scrutiny was because the Town has never reviewed an apartment complex proposal, so this project would provide the standard and the precedent. She said her concern was that this building has been unoccupied for 1 – 2 years and she wanted the endeavor to be successful. She said she was trying to ensure that the Board provides an environment that will make the project a success. She said the complexes that the Village of Cazenovia has approved, three (3) in the last three (3) years, provide walking accessibility, so she felt this proposal needed to provide sufficient amenities, sufficiently reduced rates, or needs to target a specific demographic to be viable. She felt she was asking the same questions that loan officers would ask. She asked how this could reflect the character and values that Cazenovia would want for the community there. She said she felt strongly about the huge parking lot the tenants were expected to live with. She said she would like to think the Town's scrutiny was as good as the Village's. She spoke about Village projects and the items discussed at length for their consideration. She thought having tenants look upon a factory was not "the environment the Town wanted to place people in." She said if this was not a success it would be difficult to attract another corporate endeavor willing to remove multiple kitchens and bathrooms. She said it was the Planning Board's obligation to ensure the project was given the best chance to succeed based upon the plans proposed. She said she was not happy with the way the project was being developed; she wanted "to see it look much more community based."

J. Langey said the Board must complete the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR). He asked if everyone recalled that the Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) Part 1 was submitted for this project, so FEAF Part 2 must be completed. He then led the Board through the ten (10) page review, using the listed sub-questions for each impact when the determination for each of the 18 questions was unclear. Special attention was given to Items #13 (Impact on Transportation), #17 (Consistency with Community Plans), and #18 (Consistency with Community Character). Review of the sub-questions and related discussion was extensive.

M. Stanczyck informed that Board that any finding that would not be considered significant would not trigger anything further, so the magnitude of an impact was the consideration.

J. Langey concluded that all impacts were either deemed small impact or no impact when answering the subquestions.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by H. Roszel, to affirm the matter a Type I Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the Board's review of the FEAF was carried as follows:

Town of Cazenovia – Planning Board – Meeting Minutes – March 4, 2021

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

J. Langey said he would prepare the necessary documentation showing the reasoning to support that determination in a stand-alone resolution.

J. Munger asked to return to the issue of the parking spaces on site. He asked what the minimum number of parking spaces would be for a facility like the proposed.

J. Knittel said there would be a total of 157 spaces. With two cars/unit they would need 54 spaces. He said they are in excess of 100 spots, but the spaces were existing currently.

A. Ferguson pointed out the excess parking area caused the overage of impervious surface area.

J. Munger asked if the parking could be reduced to something more reasonable.

A. Ferguson said it was the opportunity to at least bring the impervious surface area into conformance.

T. Clarke, G. Rasmussen, D. Bowers, and H. Roszel agreed that some of the blacktop should be removed.

J. Munger said he was in favor of approving the proposal if the parking spaces were to be reduced to 80.

A. Ferguson agreed.

J. Langey asked that the language be very specific, and a good description be given about where the asphalt would be removed, since he did not believe the Applicants wanted to return to the next meeting with an updated drawing. He wondered if the Applicant wanted to “chime in” about where the reduction would be done.

J. Knittel suggest they remove the asphalt on the section of parking farthest to the east, closest to Marquardt. He said more screening was requested in that area as well.

A. DiPeso said they were open to reducing some of the pavement.

A. Ferguson asked if Mr. DiPeso was agreeable to installing some appropriate screening in the grass area that would be created.

A. DiPeso answered, "Sure – that's not a problem."

Displaying the drone shot of the site, J. Knittel said the farthest row of parking spaces would amount to 18 spaces that could be removed, and he believed that would bring the impervious surface area into compliance and would provide more buffering between the apartments and the factory.

A. Ferguson countered that there were 100 extra spaces, so she thought removing 18 would not be enough. She asked if the second double row of cars closer to the building could be removed as well. She felt "a considerable improvement" could be made.

J. Langey asked Mr. Knittel how many spaces would be eliminated if the row Ms. Ferguson suggested was also removed.

J. Knittel answered an additional 20 spaces totaling 38 spaces.

A. Ferguson asked if the double row would be removed amounting to 58 spaces.

A. DiPeso said he was agreeable to the removal of those 58 spaces.

A. Ferguson thought the removal of those three rows was the least disruptive to the plan as well.

J. Langey said Mr. Knittel would have to submit a revised plan subject to Mr. Cook's approval based upon the wording of the Planning Board's conditional approval.

J. Knittel expressed his understanding.

As Mr. Langey discussed the language of the condition, A. Ferguson asked that he include the addition of screening trees between the Marquardt site and the subject site within the northern quadrant where the parking was to be removed.

J. Langey informed the Applicant that whenever landscaping was a condition there was language addressing the maintenance of the plantings as well as the replacement of any seriously diseased or dead material as soon as possible.

A. DiPeso expressed understanding.

H. Roszel asked if the driveway (between the two [2] sections of pavement that will be removed) will stay.

It will.

R. Cook informed the Board and the Applicants that upon review of the site for fire lane access, some of the particulars may be subject to change in terms of The Building Code. That review would take place after the final plans (for the permit) have been submitted. He said they may have to retain some surface that was planned to be removed and then have to remove an equal amount elsewhere. He wanted everyone to be comfortable knowing the removal might have to be altered to some degree.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by H. Roszel, to approve the site plan as most recently submitted conditioned upon the removal of the three rows of 58 marked parking spaces closest to the Marquardt factory to the north with the installation of additional plantings as a buffer between the two (2) properties and with the related maintenance of the landscaping, subject to the review for fire safety during the permitting process and conditioned upon the granting of a major special use permit by the Cazenovia Town Zoning Board of Appeals was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

J. Langey said when he sends a draft resolution to Chair Ridler, he will include Mr. Stanczyk as well.

M. Stanczyk said he would review the resolution with Mr. Knittel and they would be happy to include the amendments.

It was explained that the next step for the Applicants will be to attend the April Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

*Sadlon, Richard & Elizabeth -- Review Request – Soils – 2208 Ballina Road, Cazenovia
File # 20-1330 (Robert Ridler)*

Whitney Hughes and Mike Borkowski of Community Power Group, LLC were present to represent the file.

R. Ridler believed Don Ferlow of the Cazenovia Advisory Conservation Commission (CACC) had some information to share.

D. Ferlow said since the work session he has been in touch with a number of people and he has read the report submitted by the Applicants in great detail. He found the report they submitted to be “fairly comprehensive” but “generic from published data.” He said their report stated in several places that validation and field identification would be needed. He said a soil scientist of professional capacity would need to review the report and perform the field testing on site, and update the data submitted. He noted, for example, in one section there was mention involving haying operation, but the site grew corn last year. That was why a soil scientist was needed. He further explained that the Town would engage a consultant to then review the updated report (supplied by the Applicants’ professional). He said that would be the Applicants’ responsibility.

D. Ferlow then spoke about his efforts to find the professionals for hire. He found two (2) people who would review for the Town, Fred Gilbert from Manlius, who was a former State Soil Scientist, now retired, and Mallory Gilbert from the Albany area. At this time, he was unable to find anyone available to perform the fieldwork for the Applicants however.

D. Ferlow said the information in the report was gathered from the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Services (USDA-NRCS) and he repeated the report stated that field work would be needed. He said a base-line of the health of the soil and the quality of the soil needed to be established and to be part of the approvals for restorative measures to be done during recommissioning in 30 years. In his discussion with one of the many professionals he spoke with he was told one must check for residual or remnant pesticides and herbicides that may exist on the site if it was agricultural and active.

D. Ferlow said it was a matter of documentation. He said the State provides the data for monitoring through New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets (NYSDAM). He explained if the solar farm buries cables within conduits, they would have to be installed 18 inches deep.

A. Ferguson interjected that Mr. Ferlow was clarifying that Ms. Hughes needed to relay to her firm that they need to hire a soil expert.

D. Ferlow affirmed that was the case. He said if his search produced any available specialists, he would let Mr. Cook know.

M. Borkowski asked if the Board was trying to document the current soil composition for purposes of a restoration agreement.

D. Ferlow answered, "yes." He said soils would be documented to reestablish what would be lost while the panels were on site. He said burying cable 18 – 24 inches would break into the soil profile, explaining healthy soil has a high concentration of air and water.

M. Borkowski spoke about how soils would be improved by the termination of pesticide and herbicide usage. He said there would be no doubt that the soils would be better with the exception of where trenching would occur, but New York State has rigorous rules about how restoration should be done. He said topsoil that would be removed would need to be preserved for the restoration when it would be put back. He repeated that land is improved after lying fallow for 30 years. He said they would be agreeable to being restricted regarding herbicide use and using pollinator-friendly groundcover. He said they do that wherever they develop solar facilities. He said they have done projects throughout New York, Illinois, and Colorado, and they have never documented the soil composition. He described the measures they have done for soil health elsewhere. He questioned the need to document the soils before they were issued a permit or even before being able to apply for the special use permit/site plan review.

D. Ferlow countered that a soil report has been done and within that report provided by the Applicants it stated verification and validation were needed. He said his point from the CACC standpoint was simple, the Applicants must update their report accordingly. He felt the result would be very close to the original submittal, but it still required checking the published data using the field work suggested in their own report. He said the soils may indeed be improved after 30 years but neither he nor the Applicants could predict that. He repeated the need for the baseline information.

M. Borkowski repeated that if that was found to be important, he felt that should be a component of the building permit.

R. Cook said the Code reads that because this property falls under an Agricultural Overlay Zone in the Town, it specifically requires that the Applicants prove to the Planning Board before an application can move forward that the activity on the site will not negatively affect the prime soils that exist. He said that was why the Board was asking for the report to be validated before the Board would consider moving the application forward. He said before commencing to review a bigger permit application, it must be verified in some way that the soils will not be impacted negatively.

M. Borkowski felt a soil study for the composition of the soils would not prove that the soils would be impacted either negatively or positively. He said the report would only provide a baseline for restoration.

R. Cook said the Board needed a report showing how soils would be impacted and how they would be restored.

M. Borkowski elaborated about his objections to using a soil study for the purposes the Board needed.

R. Cook felt knowing the soil composition followed by a course of action for restoration proved that the soils would not be (permanently) negatively impacted.

M. Borkowski said they would be happy to submit a decommissioning plan, speaking about the many policies implemented for restoration by New York State. He said he wanted to make sure he answered the question (required in the Code).

D. Ferlow said the soils will be impacted by digging and perhaps even some shading and he agreed NYSDAM has major measures for restoration, but currently there was no report regarding what was on that site. He said the Applicants can commit to restoring the soils upon decommissioning, but a soil specialist could easily predict what measures would need to be done for restoration. His commission did not feel the report submitted met all the criteria without field verification and without the reviewer of the Town's own professional.

M. Borkowski said they did not have a problem creating a benchmark, but felt the timing was premature, saying if they were not to start construction for two years, the benchmark should be done just prior to construction. He felt doing it first would be "counterintuitive."

A. Ferguson said the Board's requirement has been stated and she thought perhaps Mr. Borkowski, Mr. Ferlow, and Mr. Cook could continue the discussion offline, feeling this debate was not benefitting the Board.

M. Borkowski countered that he was being asked to provide two (2) separate things. He said if he was being asked merely to benchmark the soil and that would satisfy the Board's requirement, he would do that.

A. Ferguson said the decommissioning plan would be a future requirement, coming later in the process.

M. Borkowski objected to creating a baseline now for development in the future, saying for example if there was an oil spill a year from now.

D. Ferlow said the soil composition would not measurably change in a 2 – 3-year period. He repeated the Applicants should follow their own report and verify what they have said needs to be checked.

M. Borkowski conceded that they would do that.

R. Ridler said he felt this was enough for this application for this evening.

M. Borkowski clarified that all that was needed was a validation of the soil composition.

R. Ridler said that was correct.

M. Borkowski asked if the Town would then have it revalidated or would they merely have someone review the validation report.

R. Ridler said they would have the report reviewed.

M. Borkowski said they would work on that.

Motion by H. Roszel, seconded by T. Clarke, to continue the file was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

*Catalano, Peter & Mary -- Site Plan Review – 4979 East Lake Road, Cazenovia
File # 21-1337 (Dale Bowers)*

Daniel Manning and Caleb Sayers of Daniel Manning Architect, PLLC were present to represent the file.

D. Bowers felt the file was complete. He said impervious surface area was being reduced in the Critical Environmental Area (CEA) as well some reduction in the other zones with proposed landscaping.

D. Manning said his office was located at 225 Wilkinson Street, Syracuse, NY and he was retained by Mary and Peter Catalano for the site plan review. He asked Caleb Sayers to split his screen to show the drawing he created entitled *Catalano Residence 4979 East Lake Road, Cazanovia(sic) New York SK-0 Impermeable Surface Calc* which compared the existing and the proposed footprints. He said the existing percentages all exceed the acceptable impervious surface limits, so it was a pre-existing, non-conforming condition in the Lake Watershed Riparian Corridor with Zone A having 6.4% (5% allowed); Zone B having 17.2% (10% allowed); and Zone C having 38.7% (15% allowed). He said they propose no change in the footprint of the home, but they propose to reduce impervious surface area and to add site control of the stormwater.

D. Manning pointed out the location of an existing wooden deck at grade level that at one time was a pool and an existing timber wall in Zone B that would be removed. He also indicated where there was a fire pit in Zone A that would be removed. He said there would be some improvements in Zone C as well.

D. Manning then had Mr. Sayers display the drawing entitled *Catalano Residence 4979 East Lake Road, Cazanovia (sic), New York SK-0a Proposed Site Plan*. He showed the location of the existing driveway that services a two-car garage, existing, mature trees along the north property line along the driveway, and an existing cedar hedgerow they plan to leave along the north boundary property line. They propose to reduce the square footage of the driveway by squaring it off. They also propose to create a 5-foot-wide path that will step down to a terraced area with decorative landscaping beds on either side of the terrace.

D. Manning said the existing deck toward the lake was on the first floor. He described it as a one-story, open deck, above-grade. The Owners who have young children said they were not able to use the deck this past summer because it was too hot. They propose to roof over the deck which will be for the first level and above-grade. The new roofed area would be the same size as the original deck. They would have a flattened area just outside the deck as a play area for the children. The jagged timber wall would be replaced with a stone retaining wall with a single set of steps which would maintain a level area. In that level area they would install two (2) drywells where all roof run-off and surface stormwater collection would be directed and collected. He said the other change in Zone B would be the creation of a 5-foot diameter stone fire pit with a 16-foot, gravel circular seating area. He assured the Board they included the gravel seating area in the impervious surface percentages.

D. Manning then had Mr. Sayers display the drawing *Catalano Residence 4979 East Lake Road, Cazanovia(sic) New York SK-1 Schematic Plan*. Zooming in on the deck area he explained under the shed roof there would be a small area having a wooden deck having a 16-foot diameter circular section on the first-floor level. Underneath the roof, stormwater would be collected and taken to the drywells. Below the roof would

be a covered patio area open to the exterior with a circular tanning patio extending beyond the roof line.

D. Manning then explained the improvements along the north boundary, repeating they proposed a reduction in the driveway area with the creation of a walkway having decorative landscaping on both sides of the terraced area, along the north property line, as well as along the existing house. The amount of existing patio area would be substantially reduced along the north side. These changes would result in the percentages in Zone A being reduced from 6.4% to 5.4%, Zone B 17.2% to 13.2%, and Zone C from 38.7 % to 38%. He said any landscaping would follow the Town's guidelines regarding acceptable planting material.

A. Ferguson asked the overall impervious surface area of the site.

D. Manning said he calculated it by zone but did not calculate it for the entire site.

A. Ferguson felt overall it would be much improved from what it was.

D. Bowers repeated there would be a reduction of impervious surface area in each zone. He said his only question was whether there was a lighting plan.

D. Manning said the lighting in the front would not change. He said along the side, they considered some theater-type lighting in the steps. He said the deck area at the side of the house would be lit by sconce lighting that exists on the house which would remain. He said the lighting for the lower terraced area had not been chose but it would be a similar theater lighting in the walls.

D. Bowers said he asked Mr. Ferlow about the planting schedule provided and Mr. Ferlow was fine with the schedule with the reminder that certain plants require certain soils.

J. Dunkle asked the relationship between the proposed drywells, which he thought were a great idea, and the existing septic system.

D. Manning said they would not be near each other; the existing septic system was between the house and East Lake Road.

J. Langey reviewed the SEAF for this Unlisted Action.

D. Bowers noted Madison County sent a General Municipal Law Recommendation Report (GML) and everything was fine. He jokingly stated the only condition he had was that the traditional Dutch spelling of Cazenovia be used on the drawings.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by H. Roszel, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the Board’s review of the SEAF, and to approve the site plan as most recently submitted was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

*Brown, Bernard & Beverly -- Site Plan Review – 2836 Cannon Crest Drive, Cazenovia
File # 21-1338 (Dale Bowers)*

Bernard Brown was present to represent the file.

R. Ridler explained this was a Cannon Crest site.

D. Bowers gave a historical perspective of the neighborhood in the upper east end of Cazenovia after which he said this would be the first home built in the Cannon Crest development.

B. Brown explained that he and his wife moved from Cazenovia in 1984 and now want to return to the area. He is an architect and is designing the home himself. He said being the first house, they want it to be a nice home to attract other nice homes in the future. He said the lot they chose has a large conservation area which appealed to them. He also said it was the highest lot in the subdivision. The build area on the lot, outside the constrained area, was 2.75 acres. He said the house would be just over 2000 square feet. Including the attached garage and woodshop it total 3230 square feet. It would be a single-story house in a modern farmhouse style. The garage will be attached in a New England style, wanting it to have a historical feel. He described it as a simple house having an open plan.

A. Ferguson asked if there were elevations.

D. Bowers said elevations were included in the file.

B. Brown explained that he hand-draws everything, so the elevations were not Computer-aided design (CAD) drawings.

D. Bowers asked Mr. Langey about the status of the road.

J. Langey remarked the lot was almost 7 ½ acres. He said when the development was created the road was intended to be private. Since that time, Tim Moore, the developer has indicated to his attorney, Art Bigsby, that it is no longer the case. Mr. Langey has spoken with Mr. Dunkle, the Engineer for the Town, and Mr. Slocum, the Town Highway Superintendent about evaluating the road after the snow melts to determine if it can be accepted as a Town road. At this time, it will be considered that the entire length of the road will be dedicated as a Town road as long as Mr. Slocum is satisfied with the quality of the road. He said he has no reason to believe it will not be satisfactory, but he could not personally guarantee that. Mr. Moore had originally intended to have a homeowners association (HOA) for the maintenance of the road, but Mr. Langey did not think that was fully accomplished based upon his discussion with Mr. Bigsby. Mr. Langey has prepared a road dedication documentation to present to the Town Board after Mr. Slocum has verified the condition of the road, which Mr. Langey suspected they would have by April. He did not think this process would delay the Planning Board’s decision regarding the site plan review. However, he said the house could not be started until the road was dedicated. He repeated he would hope that could be done at the April Town Board meeting.

This was a Type II Action.

D. Bowers said Madison County submitted a positive GML.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by T. Clarke to approve the site plan as most recently submitted was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

Ditrani, Leslie Tuttle, Trevor, Walter, & Kate & Tuttle, Tessa – Site Plan Review – 2836 Back File #21-1341(Jerry Munger) Acres Road, Cazenovia

Brian Manning of Teitsch Kent Fay Architects, PC was present to represent the file as was Leslie Tuttle-Ditrani.

D. Bowers recused himself for this application and Jon Vanderhoef assumed the role of a voting member in his place.

J. Munger said he and Mr. Ridler visited the site the day before. As Mr. Bowers described the situation to them, there was a section of existing camp that was on a block foundation. Based on Mr. Bowers' recommendation, that foundation was key to any renovation.

B. Manning said he also agreed with Mr. Bowers' recommendation (to rebuild the foundation). He said part of the original camp was built on concrete pier foundations. They would like to put a proper, full-wall foundation in its place. They were previously approved for improvements (with some additional construction) and as they moved forward with that approval, they discovered this situation. He said the proposal was basically for the foundation upgrade, "changing the foundation method."

J. Munger asked if the section of foundation in question was the northern section of the structure.

B. Manning affirmed it was. He called it the original bedroom wing.

R. Ridler asked if the footprint of the structure would remain the same.

B. Manning said that was correct. He clarified all other improvements were previously approved.

J. Langey said this would be a Type II Action.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by A. Ferguson, to approve the site plan as most recently submitted was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Jon Vanderhoef	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

*Beyer, Eric -- Minor (1 lot) Subdivision – 1601 Grassy Lane, Cazenovia
File # 21-1342 (Anne Ferguson)*

Eric Beyer was present to represent the file as was his realtor, Allen Olmsted of Canaan Realty.

A. Ferguson said the application was for a minor subdivision and asked Mr. Beyer to explain his intentions.

E. Beyer explained he currently has five (5) buildings, and he would like to downsize by selling the house, the cottage, the pond and approximately ten (10) acres, keeping the barn, the garage, and the animal building on the remaining 86 acres on the other side of the street, eventually dividing that piece into three (3) other lots.

A. Ferguson said because of the size of the lot, this one time carve out of ten (10) acres would be allowed even if a conservation subdivision were to be done in the future.

A. Ferguson explained the location of the property, saying some of it borders Pauline Monz's property which was being converted to a preservation land trust in Onondaga County so it will be a protected zone.

H. Roszel asked if Grassy Lane extends past the house.

E. Beyer said it dead ends at the house now, at one time it did extend farther.

More discussion followed regarding the history of the road.

J. Langey led the Board through the SEAF.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by D. Bowers, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the Board's review of the SEAF was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by T. Clarke, to move the application to a public hearing at the next meeting and to continue the file was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

*Stocks, Bryan & Sarah -- Review Request – Tucker Road, Cazenovia
(Owned by Warner, Andrew)
File # 21-1343 (Bryan Wendel)*

Bryan Stocks was present to represent the file.

R. Ridler explained this was a request to move a building envelope line.

B. Stocks said they were in the process of purchasing the Tucker Road property which has a long rectangular building envelope. They would like to extend the building envelope 100 feet to the north for the placement of a barn. He said it would be advantageous to locate the barn in that location to be in keeping with an agricultural intent and to make the location "more appealing."

R. Ridler understood there were a number of covenants on the property that were created in part by Matthew Potteiger. Mr. Potteiger sent an email to the Board stating he approves the request to extend the building envelope, saying, "it would be consistent with the agricultural uses of the area" and he does not see "any problem with the request."

J. Langey asked if there was a drawing of the newly proposed envelope.

B. Stocks shared his screen and displayed the sketched drawing he submitted with his application.

J. Langey said this would be a Type II Action. He said the Board could waive the public hearing for this request as well.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by H. Roszel, to approve the building envelope change as most recently submitted was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by H. Roszel, to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 P. M. was carried as follows:

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes.

Sue Wightman, Planning Board Secretary – March 5, 2021