

TOWN OF LYSANDER
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
8220 Loop Road
Thursday, August 12, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Town of Lysander Planning Board as held Thursday, August 12, 2021 at 7:30 p.m. at the Lysander Town Building, 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Corey, Chairman; Hugh Kimball, William Lester and Steve Darcangelo

MEMBERS ABSENT: Doug Beachel

OTHERS PRESENT: Al Yager, Town Engineer; Tim Frateschi, Planning Board Attorney; Frank Costanzo, ZBA; Paula Zebrowski; Pamela Fortino; Kevin Rode; Michael Kester; Michael Barker; Rob Helfrich; Christina Nanna; James Trasher, CHA; Richard Andino, Costello, Cooney & Fearon; Doug Reith, CNY Land Surveying; Denise Lotano; Robert Smith, Costello, Cooney & Fearon and Karen Rice Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

I. PUBLIC HEARING -- 7:00 p.m.

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1. Minor Subdivision Case No. 2021—0006 | Fenzl, Richard Church Road |
|--|-------------------------------|

Th Public Hearing opened at 7:00 p.m.

Doug Reith, CNY Land Surveying, stated that Mr. Fenzl owns 62 acres being divided into two lots, Lot 1 with 55.896 acres and Lot 2 with 2.65 acres. The big lot is remaining woods and farm field with Lot 2 being residential with an existing home, well, septic system and driveway, as shown, which was one of the comments from the Onondaga County Planning Board. The farm access has also been shown.

The Public Hearing closed at 7:03 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING -- 7:05 p.m.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 2. Minor Subdivision Case No. 2021—007 | Loop Road Development 8245 Loop Road |
|---|---|

The Public Hearing opened at 7:05 p.m.

James Trasher, CHA, represented the applicant stating that they are proposing a subdivision of the Loop Road Storage facility. The Site Plan was approved for the storage facility with the ability to construct two office buildings. It is our desire to create Lots 2 and 3 for the purpose of the two different buildings and bank financing; so, we're here for a two-lot subdivision, Lot 1 is

where the storage facility is, Lot 2 and Lot 3 would be future locations of a couple of office buildings in the near future.

Th Public Hearing closed at 7:06 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Review and approval of the minutes of the July 8, 2021 regular Planning Board meeting.

RESOLUTION #1 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the July 8, 2021 regular Planning Board meeting be approved as submitted.

3 Ayes -- 1 Abstain (Lester, as he was not in attendance, however they were excellently written)

III. OLD BUSINESS

1. Minor Subdivision
Case No. 2021—006

Fenzl, Richard
Church Road

There is a letter on file dated August 12, 2021, prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, that will be made part of the public record, in part:

I have completed my review of the Fenzl Church Road Minor Subdivision, prepared by CNY Land Surveying, dated June 6, 2021. Overall it appears that the proposed subdivision conforms to all applicable Town Code requirements as presented. I would have no objections to the Planning Board approving this minor subdivision.

This application was forwarded to the Onondaga County Planning Board for their review and recommendation, who made the following determination that will be made part of the public record, in part:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Onondaga County Planning Board has determined that said referral will have no significant adverse inter-community or county-wide implications. The Board has offered the following COMMNETS in regard to the referral:

1. To ensure access to Church Road will be granted and that the proposed lots meet minimum sight distance requirements, the applicant is advised to contact the Onondaga County Department of Transportation prior to municipal approval of the subdivision and submit sight distance estimates to the Department for their review.
2. The Board encourages the Town to consider the potential long-term effects of land fragmentation, large lot, strip subdivisions along road frontages, and division of farmsteads and farmlands onto separate lots on the economic viability of agricultural lands, particularly within areas containing New York State Agricultural District properties and in farm/agricultural zoning districts. Potential conflicts with agricultural operations, changes to the rural character of the surrounding area, increases in public service demands and costs, reduction of open space and farmland, and impacts to road safety and mobility may cumulatively occur as a result of such subdivisions.

Steve Darcangelo questioned why the subdivision of the parcel in this odd shaped configuration.

Doug Reith, CNY Land Surveying, stated that it is following the farmed area.

Mr. Darcangelo further questioned if the telephone service running through the property services the adjacent parcel.

Mr. Reith stated that he doesn't know because they can't find it once it crosses that small existing lot. We could not get anybody to tell us where it is.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if there was an existing easement for it.

Mr. Reith...not that we could find; which is not unusual.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if there should be.

Mr. Reith concurred, however utility usually just puts them in. If you get into a Village a lot of times you'll see easements. If they do have them it's so general you can't figure out where they are.

FINDINGS:

An Environmental Assessment Form indicates that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

There is a letter on file from Al Yager, Town Engineer, dated August 12, 2021, that has been made part of the public record.

There is a letter on file from the Onondaga County Planning Board, dated July 14, 2021, that has been made part of the public record.

This action is consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

This action is consistent with the Town's current Zoning Ordinances.

This action will cause no adverse effects on the public health, safety and welfare in the neighborhood or district.

RESOLUTION #2 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Lester

RESOLVED, that having reviewed the Minor Subdivision application, as defined on a map dated June 6, 2021, revised July 7, 2021, prepared by Douglas Reith, Licensed Land Surveyor, associated with the application of Richard Fenzl, for property located at 1201 Church, Tax Map No. 026.-03-13.1, Baldwinsville, New York is hereby approved.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

RESOLUTION #3 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that in granting a subdivision to Richard Fenzl, for property located at 1201 Church Road, Baldwinsville, New York, the Planning Board invokes its right to impose a fee of \$250.00 per lot for one (1) lots in lieu of land for the development of parks, playgrounds, recreation or open land areas in the Town.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes (There is an existing home and the remnant piece will remain under agriculture)

All fees associated with this application are paid.

State law states that the applicant shall file the final plat in the Onondaga County Clerk's office within sixty-two (62) days from the date of final approval or such approval shall expire. The applicant shall also file one copy of the final plat in the Lysander Clerk's office.

2. Minor Subdivision
Case No. 2021—007

Loop Road Development
8245 Loop Road

John Corey recapped that the subdivision of land is for business reasons associated with the land. Nothing has changed from the original proposal. We're just creating two additional lots.

James Trasher, CHA, concurred.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that he believes it's just so he can take a mortgage for a construction loan.

There was some discussion with regard to access. All access will be through the existing driveway, no new road cuts are proposed.

Tim Frateschi, Esq., asked that a cross easement between Lot 2 and 3 be shown on the Final Plat.

Mr. Yager concurred stating that there should be a condition placed on the resolution.

There was some discussion with regard to the site plan previously approved and whether or not the applicant will have to come back before the Board for Site Plan Approval for any proposed buildings.

It was determined that Site Plan Approval was approved for the overall site and the applicant will not have to come back before the Board unless he makes changes to the footprint.

There's a letter on file dated August 12, 2021 prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, that will be made part of the public record, in part: I have completed my review of the plat for the above referenced minor subdivision prepared by Ianuzi & Romans Land Surveying, PC dated June 10, 2020. The proposed subdivision conforms to all applicable Town Code requirements as presented and matches what was shown in the previously approved site plan for the overall project.

I would have no objections to the Planning Board approving this minor subdivision at this time contingent on a cross lot access easement for all three lots being added to the map prior to signature by the Planning Board Chairman.

This application was forwarded to the Onondaga County Planning Board for their review and recommendation, that will be made part of the public record, in part:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Onondaga County Planning Board has determined that said referral will have no significant adverse inter-community or county-wide implications and may consequently be acted on solely by the referring board.

Steve Darcangelo questioned the water easement that runs through the property.

Mr. Yager stated that the easement has been abandoned by a quit claim deed previously.

FINDINGS:

An Environmental Assessment Form indicates that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

There is a letter on file from Al Yager, Town Engineer, dated August 12, 2021, that has been made part of the public record.

There is a letter on file from the Onondaga County Planning Board, dated August 4, 2021, that has been made part of the public record.

This action is consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

This action is consistent with the Town's current Zoning Ordinances.

This action will cause no adverse effects on the public health, safety and welfare in the neighborhood or district.

RESOLUTION #4 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Lester

RESOLVED, that having reviewed the Minor Subdivision application, as defined on a map dated June 6, 2021, prepared by Ianuzi & Romans Land Surveying, P.C., associated with the application of Alberici Excavation & Development, for property located at 8245 Loop Road, Tax Map No. 057.-02-033.0, Baldwinsville, New York is hereby approved with the following condition:

- 1) A cross lot access easement for all three (3) lots be added to the Final Plat prior to signature by the Planning Board Chairman

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

RESOLUTION #3 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Lester

RESOLVED, that in granting a subdivision to Alberici Excavation & Development & Development, for property located at 8245 Loop Road Baldwinsville, New York, the Planning Board invokes its right to impose a fee of \$250.00 per lot for one (3) lots in lieu of land for the development of parks, playgrounds, recreation or open land areas in the Town.

0 Ayes -- 4 Noes VOTE: (Fees in Lieu of Land are not collected for property within the Radisson PUD)

All fees associated with this application are paid.

State law states that the applicant shall file the final plat in the Onondaga County Clerk's office within sixty-two (62) days from the date of final approval or such approval shall expire. The applicant shall also file one copy of the final plat in the Lysander Clerk's office.

Mr. Trasher thanked the Board for their time.

3. Controlled Site Use
Case No. 2021—0002

Ranalli ALA, LLC
Hencle Blvd/NYS Route 48

John Corey, Chairman, stated that the Board will review Part 2 of the Long Environmental Assessment Form (EAF). We have asked Tim Frateschi, Planning Board Attorney, to take us through that process.

Mr. Frateschi stated that on April 8, 2021 this Board reviewed Part 2 of the Long EAF; at that time the project was for a 1,000,000 square foot project. It has changed since then so I thing

we should go over Part 2 to see how the reduction in size has changed any answers to that form. Also, after that meeting, you asked me to draft a resolution that reflected the questions and the answers that were given on April 8th. I have done that and provided you with a copy of that draft resolution tonight. Frankly, they have to work in coordination with each other, both Part 2 of the EAF and the resolution so I might be referencing both of the; but let's start with Part 2 of the EAF and compare it to one that was filled out on April 8th. Of course, the applicant has provided us with a new Part 1 with updated information, the Town Engineer has looked at it; I've looked at it...it seems to be accurate as it relates to all of the questions that were provided for in Part 1.

Full Environmental Assessment Form
Part 2 – Identification of Potential Project Impacts:

IMPACT ON LAND:

- 1) Proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of the land surface of the proposed site?

Yes, we answered no to small impact on a, b and c; we answered moderate to large impact may occur on d and e. We answered no to small impact on f and g. I would like to cross reference the Finding and Determination No. 9; which we will be reading through. That answers 1 d. as it relates to the 1,000 tons of top soil being removed off of the property and then on the construction time of more than year. The mitigation was that first of all it has been reduced from a three-phase project to a one phase project that would take 24 months. The impacts of 24month construction are minimal considering the size of the property and the fact that there are few, if any residences that will be impacted by the length of time of the construction; plus as we all know the size of the property will accommodate all of the construction that will take place without a lot of impacts on the roads.

Board members concurred.

Mr. Frateschi stated that that hasn't changed very much from the April 8th meeting.

IMPACT ON GEOLOGICAL FEATURES

- 2) The proposed action may result in the modification or destruction of, or inhibit access to, any unique or unusual land forms on the site (e.g., cliffs, dunes, minerals, fossils, caves). NO

Board members concurred.

IMPACTS ON SURFACE WATER:

- 3) The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies (e.g., streams, rivers, ponds or lakes). YES

All of the a through k were no or small impacts may occur. The only one that was kind of implicated was d. The proposed action may involve construction within or adjoining a freshwater or tidal wetland, or in the bed or banks of any other water body. We did get a revised wetland delineation that shows wetlands on this site; but that mitigation has been set forth in the Finding and Determination No. 10; which we will read later, as to why they basically moved stormwater facilities away from the buffer zone so we don't think there will be an impact on any wetlands.

Al Yager, Town Engineer.

Mr. Frateschi continued stating that while the answer is yes, it's all no or small impacts may occur.

Board members concurred.

IMPACT GROUNDWATER:

- 4) Proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquifer. NO

Mr. Frateschi stated that the answer we gave before was no and I think the answer again today is no. The reasons for that are found in Finding and Determination No. 2; which we will read later, but there has been a lot of discussion about the aquifer and where it is in relation to the project, whether it's below the project site, it has been indicated to us that it is not below the project site, it's south of the project site and the depth of construction will not impact the aquifer.

Board members concurred.

IMPACT ON FLOODING:

- 5) The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding. NO

NOTATION: There is a stream in the vicinity that is prone to flooding, Tannery Creek, that has flooded a number of times in the last thirty (30) years and has resulted in property damage.

A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be required.

Mr. Frateschi stated that nothing has changed in this finding.

Board members concurred.

IMPACTS ON AIR

- 6) The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source. NO

Mr. Frateschi stated that nothing has changed in this finding.

Board members concurred.

IMPACT ON PLANTS AND ANIMALS:

- 7) The proposed action may result in a loss of flora or fauna. YES

In April, James Trasher, CHA, stated that 95% of the project is farm field, the remainder is scrub brush. There is no indication that there's anything unique or special about the fauna. Any clearing, if there are trees that come down, we will follow State regulations.

A letter from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) was requested, however if you look at the 'circle & squares' map in Part 1 of the SEQR you will see that new review is necessary. A letter will be sent to SHPO as part of the permit process; they are required to respond. A wetland delineation will be required.

Mr. Frateschi stated that nothing has changed in this finding; a through i all of the answers will be no or small impacts may occur. The only one that seems to be implicated may be a...the proposed action may cause reduction of population or loss of individuals of any threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site. We are not aware of any endangered species or threatened species that are on the site. There has been some discussion about some potential endangered species at Three Rivers Game Management Area, but that has been addressed by Finding and Determination No. 6, which we will read.

Board members concurred.

IMPACT ON AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES:

8) The proposed action may impact agricultural resources. NO

April's finding was that the property has been farmed in the past, however it is an Industrial site.

Mr. Frateschi stated that today I think the answer is going to be yes, there will be an impact on agriculture resources, sub question a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System. That's the only potential impact, but we believe it's a no or small impact and that is reflected in Finding and Determination No. 14; which we will read. All the rest of them would be no or small impact may occur.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned how many acres of agricultural land there is in the Township.

Mr. Frateschi stated that Ag District Land and Land that is part of an Ag District I believe the number is 14,500 acres. This parcel is not designated as Agricultural District.

Mr. Darcangelo concurred...just because of the soil characteristics.

Board members concurred.

IMPACT ON AESTHETIC RESOURCES:

9) The land use of the proposed action are obviously different from, or are in sharp contrast to, current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource. NO

Mr. Frateschi stated that this finding will not change.

Board members concurred.

IMPACT ON HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

10) The proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource. NO.

Mr. Frateschi stated that this finding will not change.

Board members concurred.

IMPACT ON OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION:

11) The proposed action may result in a loss of recreational opportunities or a reduction of an open space resource as designated in any adopted municipal open space plan. NO

Mr. Frateschi stated that this finding will not change.

Board members concurred.

IMPACT ON CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL AREAS:

12) The proposed action may be located within or adjacent to a critical environmental area (CEA). NO.

Mr. Frateschi stated that this finding will not change.

Board members concurred.

IMPACT ON TRANSPORTATION:

- 13) The proposed action may result in a change to existing transportation systems.
YES

In April, in reviewing a through f, No, or small impact may occur. There was some discussion regard to a: Projected traffic increase may exceed capacity of existing road network.

A Traffic Impact Study has been provided by GTS Consulting, they have indicated that there will be some minor impact on roads and intersections but none that would degrade the level of traffic anything worse than what exists now. They have also proposed four or five mitigation measures that would offset some of the increase in traffic.

Mr. Trasher stated that they did this two-ways; phased and at full build-out. Phase I construction there is no impact, the overall mitigation measures once we construct the full 1,007,500 square feet is signal timing and things like that. We've met with both the Onondaga County Department of Transportation (County DOT) and the New York State Department of Transportation (NYS DOT). They are reviewing the plan now, they have indicated that they have no issues or problems with what we are proposing.

Mr. Frateschi stated to the Board to keep in context that this is an Industrial area adjacent to highways that have been constructed to handle exactly the type of traffic that is being proposed for this project.

There was some discussion with regard to b: The proposed action may result in the construction of paved parking area for 500 or more vehicles. Yes, they are proposing 750 parking spaces. All parking is on site on a 122-acre site.

Mr. Trasher stated that we probably have more parking than required, but the developer wanted to make sure that everyone has a parking spot and cars don't run into one another. We have three shifts, with 350 per shift being utilized.

There was considerable discussion with regard to traffic and whether b should be a Moderate to large impact may occur. The Board will wait or correspondence from the County and State DOT.

The answer tonight is also Yes, there is one change by reduction of the size of the building from a million square feet to 360,000 square foot. The parking lot has changed. I think it was 750 parking spaces and has been reduced to 406 parking spaces, which is below the threshold of sub question b, the proposed action may result in the construction of paved parking area for 500 or more vehicles.

Mr. Frateschi stated that even though the answer is they will have an impact on transportation, no or small impacts may occur and that's reflected in Finding and Determination related to the Traffic Impact Study and letters from the NYS Department of Transportation and the Onondaga County Department of Transportation; which we will be reading.

Board members concurred.

IMPACT ON ENERGY:

- 14) The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy.
YES

In April, in reviewing a through e, No, or small impact may occur, with the exception of d: The proposed action may involve heating and/or cooling of more than 100,000 square feet of building area when completed. Moderate to large impact may occur as the building is ten times that amount.

Mr. Frateschi stated that this finding will not change and will be addressed in Finding and Determination No. 21, which we will be reading.

Board members concurred.

IMPACT ON NOISE, ODOR AND LIGHT:

15) The proposed action may have an impact on noise, odors, or outdoor lighting. YES

In April, in reviewing a through f, No, or small impact may occur. A photometric site plan will be provided.

Mr. Frateschi stated that this answer will not change. There will several comments and are addressed in Finding and Determination No. 22, which we will be reading.

Board members concurred.

IMPACT ON HUMAN HEALTH:

16) The proposed action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants. NO

Mr. Frateschi stated that this finding will not change.

Board members concurred.

CONSISTENCY WITH COMMUNITY PLANS

17) The proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans. NO

Mr. Frateschi stated that this finding will not change.

Board members concurred.

CONSISTENCY WITH COMMUNITY CHARACTER

18) The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character. NO

The property is zoned Industrial, it is properly zoned for this specific use.

Mr. Frateschi stated that this finding will not change.

Board members concurred.

Mr. Frateschi stated that having gone through the Long Environmental Assessment Form Part 2, this document will be supplemented by the Resolution you asked me to draft in April, which reflects a Negative Declaration under SEQ. I am not going to go through all of the WHEREAS clauses, but I will go through the Findings and Determinations if everybody thinks that is appropriate.

Board members asked that those findings be read into the record.

Mr. Frateschi stated that there is one WHEREAS that has been left blank because we had to go through the EAF and the following changes to the EAF Part 2 that I have documented so far are the Agricultural answer (changed to Yes) and the Transportation sub question was changed to no, or small impact as it relates to the parking area; which will be filled in. In reviewing the Finding and Determination, just indicate by saying I agree.

**IN THE MATTER
Of
STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW
ACT
DETERMINATION FOR
RANALLI ALA, LLC
SITE PLAN**

**Resolution 2021-006

DETERMINATION OF
ENVIRONMENTAL
SIGNIFICANCE OF PROJECT**

Motion by Corey, Second by Lester

The **TOWN PLANNING BOARD OF THE TOWN OF LYSANDER**, in the County of Onondaga, State of New York, met in regular session at the Town Hall in the Town of Lysander, located at 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York 13027, County of Onondaga, State of New York, on the 12th day of August, 2021, at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was called to order by John B. Corey, as Chairman, and the following were present, namely:

| | |
|-------------------|----------|
| John B. Corey | Chairman |
| Hubert D. Kimball | Member |
| William Lester | Member |
| Steve Darcangelo | Member |

Absent: Doug Beachel Member

WHEREAS, the Ranalli ALA LLC (the “Applicant”) originally proposed the construction of a 1 million square foot warehouse and distribution center at the intersection of Hencle Blvd., Oswego Road (Route 48) and I -690;

WHEREAS, on or about July 8, 2021, the Applicant revised the proposal and reduced the size of the building to 360,000 sq. ft (the “Building”) by eliminating the originally proposed Phase II and Phase III of the project (the revised proposal hereinafter referred to as the “Project”);

WHEREAS, the Applicant, through its engineers (CHA Engineers), has submitted a site plan package (the “Site Plan Package”) entitled “Proposed Warehouse, 8626 Oswego Road, Town of Lysander, New York,” prepared by CHA, which consists of the following Sheets: C-001 Title Sheet, C-003 Existing Conditions, C-100 Overall Layout, C-101 Site Layout, C-102 Site Layout, C-200 Overall Grading, C-201 Site Grading, C-202 Site Grading, C-203 Site Grading, C-204 Site Grading, C-300 Overall Utility Plan, C-301 Site Utility Plan, C-302 Site Utility Plan, C-303 Site Utility Plan, C-400 Landscaping Plan, C-500 Overall Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, C-551 Erosion Control Details, C-601 Details, C-602 Details, C-603 Details, C-604 Details, C-700 Lighting Plan, C-701 Lighting Details, C-702 Lighting Details, identified as Project No. 23278.9074, and dated 3-17-2, last revision date 7-23-21;

WHEREAS, the Project is proposed to be situated on three separate vacant parcels (which the Planning Board will require to be merged if approved), identified as tax map nos. 055-01-19.1, 055-01-18.0, and 055-01-20.0, which together equal 122.6 acres (the “Property” or “Project Site”);

WHEREAS, of the 122.6 acres, the Applicant has proposed to disturb approximately 23%, or 27.9 acres of the Property;

WHEREAS, when the Project is completed, only 15.5 acres of the 122.6 acres, or less than 10%, will be impervious surfaces;

WHEREAS, the remaining vacant lands will be used to buffer the Building with open space and accommodate for stormwater run-off;

WHEREAS, the Planning Board and its engineer has reviewed the Site Plan Package and has considered it in relation to the SEQRA review and findings set forth herein;

WHEREAS, the existing zoning for the Project Site is Industrial and has been zoned Industrial of several decades;

WHEREAS, the Project is now proposed to be developed in one phase – a 360,000 sq. ft. building with construction to be completed within an estimated 24 months;

WHEREAS, land uses in the adjacent surrounding area are low intensity commercial, some individual residents situated on Church Road, NYS Rt. 48 and the closest subdivision being Giddings Crest (approximately 93 building lots), with the closest residents in this subdivision being approximately .7 miles feet from the Project Site;

WHEREAS, because 27 acres of the Property will be disturbed by the construction of the Project, it qualifies the Action as a Type I action under Article 8 of the New York State Environment Law and 6 NYCRR ("SEQRA");

WHEREAS, on February 11, 2021, pursuant to NYCRR Part 617.6(b), the Lysander Planning Board (the "Planning Board") declared itself the Lead Agency and issued to all involved agencies a Notice of Intent that classified the Project as a Type I action and further stated that it intended to be the Lead Agency for the Action;

WHEREAS, no involved agency responded in objection to the Notice of Intent for Lead Agency;

WHEREAS, on March 4, 2021 the New York State Department of Transportation submitted a letter to the Town Planning Board Chairman identifying concerns related to traffic, highway work permits, right-of-way issues and utility installation and requested a copy of the stormwater pollution and prevention plan ("SWPPP");

WHEREAS, on March 22, 2021, the Planning Board held a scoping session for all the involved agencies to determine any environmental concerns they may have - none of the involved agencies attended or submitted comments;

WHEREAS, the Applicant has provided the Town Planning Board with a revised Traffic Impact Study (the "Traffic Impact Study"), dated July 2021, prepared by GTS Consulting, Inc. ("GTS"), reflecting the reduction of the Building size from 1 million sq. ft. to 360,000 sq. ft., in which GTS indicates that the level of traffic generated by the Project will not significantly degrade traffic level services in and around the area;

WHEREAS, the Traffic Impact Study recommend several mitigation measures to reduce traffic impacts;

WHEREAS, the New York State Department of Transportation (NYS DOT), which controls access to NYS Rt. 48, the point of ingress/egress for the Project, has been asked by the Applicant and the Town Engineer to review the Traffic Impact Study to assess whether the information provided in the Traffic Impact Study is sufficient to warrant the ingress/egress proposed by the Applicant and whether the mitigation measures proposed are sufficient to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the Project;

WHEREAS, by letter dated July 14, 2021, the NYS DOT has determined that the Traffic Impact Study and the ingress/egress to State Rt. 48 is sufficient to accommodate the additional traffic from the Project and has recommended several mitigation measures to improve the flow of traffic in and around the Project site (the "NYS DOT Letter" attached hereto as Exhibit A and made part of the Findings and Determinations below);

WHEREAS, the Onondaga County Department of Transportation (the "County DOT"), which controls Hencle Blvd, which was originally second point of ingress/egress for the Project, has been asked by the Applicant and the Town Engineer to review the Traffic Impact Study to assess whether the information provided in the Traffic Impact Study is sufficient to warrant the ingress/egress proposed by the Applicant and whether the mitigation measures proposed are sufficient to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the Project;

WHEREAS, by memo dated July 6, 2021, the County DOT has determined that the Traffic Impact Study acceptable for the portion that pertains to Hencle Blvd. but that Hencle Blvd is determined to be a highway "without access" (the "County DOT Memo", which is attached to this Resolution as Exhibit B and made part of the Findings and Determinations below);

WHEREAS, by letter dated April 1, 2021 and follow up letter dated August 11, 2021, the Engineer for the Town has reviewed the Traffic Impact Study and based on his review and the NYS DOT Letter and the County DOT Memo, agrees that the mitigation measures proposed by the Applicant will eliminate or moderate any significant impacts on traffic in and around the Project Site (the "Engineer Review Letters");

WHEREAS, the Land is zoned Industrial under the Town Code and the use proposed by the Applicant is in keeping with the allowed zoning and the character and nature of this area;

WHEREAS, CHA submitted to the Town Engineer a Stormwater Pollution and Prevention Plan (“SWPPP”) date August 2021 which identifies stormwater run-off issues and proposed stormwater facilities that will meet the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation regulations (See Engineer’s Review Letter of August 11, 2021);

WHEREAS, by resolution dated June 21, 2021, the Onondaga County Planning Agency indicated that it met on April 21, 2021 to review the original 1 million sq. ft. building proposal and it made four (4) modifications that it requested from the Applicant;

WHEREAS, by resolution dated August 4, 2021, the Onondaga Planning Agency re-examined the Project based on the reduction of the Building to 360,000 sq. ft. and made three (3) modifications that it is requesting of the Applicant and two (2) comments, all of which the Planning Board agrees with and makes part of this Resolution and the findings and determinations below;

WHEREAS, on April 8, 2021, at its monthly meeting, the Planning Board reviewed, discussed and asked questions to the CHA Engineers regarding Part II of the Long Environmental Assessment Form (the “EAF”) and answered the 18 questions set forth therein based on the 1 million sq. ft. original proposal;

WHEREAS, the Planning Board identified six areas of potential environmental impact as follows: (i) Impact on Land; (ii) Impacts on Surface Water; (iii) Impacts on Plants and Animals; (iv) Impacts on Transportation; (v) Impacts on Energy; and (vi) Impacts on Noise, Odor and Light;

WHEREAS, of the six potential environmental impacts set forth in the previous paragraph, the Planning Board determined that the standards set forth in the EAF sub-questions indicated “no, or small impact may occur” for all identified potential environmental impacts except for:

Question 1(d), which indicates the proposed action may involve the excavation and removal of 1,000 tons of natural material, and

Question 13(a) and (b), which indicates that the action may increase traffic to exceed capacity of existing road network and the construction of paved parking for more than 500 or more vehicles;

Question 14(d), which indicates that the action may involve the heating and/or cooling of more than 100,000 square feet of building when completed;

WHEREAS, the FINDINGS and DETERMINATIONS set forth below explain the Planning Board’s opinion on Question 1(d), Question 13(a) (b) and Question 14(d) above and other issues of environmental concern expressed to the Planning Board;

WHEREAS, on August 12, 2021, the Planning Board re-reviewed Part I and Part II of the EAF based on the updated information provided by the Applicant that reduced the size of the Building from one million sq. ft to 360,000 sq. ft. and made the following changes to the EAF Part II:

1. (8) Impact on Agricultural Resource – yes, with no to small impacts;
2. (13) Impact on Transportation---parking area reduced below 500.

WHEREAS, based on the review of the Site Plan Package, Part I and Part II of the EAF, the Planning Board’s familiarity of the Project Site, the Town’s Comprehensive Plan, the zoning designation of the Property as Industrial, and the comments received by the public, and the Recitals stated above, the Planning Board hereby makes the following FINDINGS and DETERMINATIONS, which will be added as a supplement to the EAF Part II and III:

1. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The purpose of the Industrial Zone, the zoning designation where the Project is situated, is “for uses which focus on the movement, storage or processing of raw materials or finished/semifinished goods. Good access to major transportation routes (highway, railroad or river) is to be encouraged as is separation from and buffering from nearby residential areas.” Section 320-31 of the Town Code
2. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The Project and its use (as a warehouse and distribution facility) fits directly within the purposes for a business in the Industrial Zone because the Property has direct, or nearly direct, access to major highways (I-690, State Route 48, Hencle Blvd, the New York State Thruway and Interstate 81).

3. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** After three public hearings and input from the Planning Board, the Applicant reduced the size of the proposed Building from 1 million sq. ft. to 360,000 sq. ft which has significantly lessened the environmental impact of the Project in terms of traffic, the length of time for construction, ingress/egress issues, visual impacts, wetland impacts, impacts on soils and ground cover excavation.
4. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The general nature and character of the adjoining surrounding land use is low intensity commercial or vacant land, with possibly some individualized residences north, west and south of the Project Site.
5. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The Giddings Crest subdivision is approximately .7 miles from the Project Site boundary, which distance will prevent any direct environmental impact from the Project, including but not limited to noise, lighting, odor or construction impacts. (See Exhibit C to this Resolution – an arial/satellite depiction of the Giddings Crest subdivision and its proximity to the Property prepared by the Town Engineer)
6. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** Between the Giddings Crest subdivision and the Project Site is forested land, which buffering will prevent any direct environmental impact from the Project. (See Exhibit C to this Resolution – an arial/satellite depiction of the Giddings Crest subdivision and its proximity to the Property prepared by the Town Engineer)
7. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The existing topography, which provides a crest vertical curve, or hill, from the Project Site to the Giddings Crest subdivision will prevent any direct environmental impact from the Project. (See Exhibit C to this Resolution – an arial/satellite depiction of the Giddings Crest subdivision and its proximity and elevation to the Property prepared by the Town Engineer)
8. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The Planning Board adopts the conclusions and recommendations of the modified Traffic Impact Study as it relates to ingress/egress, traffic distribution, level of service at intersection and parking, based on the NYS DOT Letter, the County DOT Memo and the Town Engineer Letter.
9. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** While the Applicant is proposing the excavation or removal of more than 1,000 tons of natural material (topsoil) (See Question 1(d) of the EAF Part 2), the Property is large enough to accommodate such excavation and removal since the disturbance will be approximately 23% of the total Property acreage and a significant amount of excavated natural material will remain on the Project Site. Based on the Applicant's representations, any material that is taken off the Project Site during development will be repurposed or processed as screened topsoil. Finally, the Applicant mitigated the amount of topsoil being taken off the Project Site by reducing the size of the building from 1 million sq. ft. to 360,000 sq. ft.
10. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The SWPPP submitted by CHA provides enough information to indicate that the onsite stormwater can be managed on the Property because of the amount of vacant land remaining after construction (See Engineer's Letter dated August 11, 2021). The grading plan, presented as part of the Site Plan Package shows the bioretention area has been moved away from the wetland buffer, which should not be disturbed. In the event the buffer or wetland is disturbed, the Applicant will be required to obtain a NYS DEC and Army Corp of Engineer's permit, which shall be a condition of any Site Plan approval, in additions to the conditions set forth in Finding and Determination 11 below.
11. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** While the Planning Board has determined that there will be no significant environmental impact on flooding (Question 5 of the EAF Part 2), during the Site Plan process the Planning Board will pay special attention to the SWPPP and require mitigation efforts to ensure that construction near the Tannery Creek area accounts for proper drainage management of this water body, not including downstream maintenance issues such as culvert cleaning and stream overgrowth management.
12. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** There is no indication from the EAF Mapper that there are any endangered species, natural communities of animals, or rare plants and animals on the Property.
13. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, which is an Involved Agency and was invited to participate in the Scoping Session for SEQRA, did not provide the Planning Board with any comments related to the environmental impacts of the Project on the Three Rivers Wildlife Management Area. The Town Engineer has contacted the staff at the NYSDEC and at Three Rivers Wildlife Management Area to verify that the SEQRA coordinated review package was received along with the revised Site Plan Package. No concerns have been raised by NYSDEC about the impacts of the Project on Three Rivers Wildlife Management Area and the plants and animals at Three Rivers Wildlife Management Area.
14. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** While part of the Project Site has previously been used for agricultural purposes, and the soils may qualify under soil groups 1 to 4 (see EAF Part II question 8(a)), the Property and has been set aside by the Town of Lysander for Industrial purposes and is properly zoned for the use proposed by the Applicant, as

set forth above. The Zoning Map of the Town of Lysander indicates that most of the land in the Town is zoned for agricultural purposes and removing the Project Site from agricultural use will be insignificant in the overall opportunity for agricultural uses of land in the Town.

15. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The Applicant submitted Phase I (Ia and Ib) Cultural Resource Investigations Report that indicates that no further archeological work is required to determine whether this is an archaeologically sensitive site, that the Planning Board accepts this Report in full.
16. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The Traffic Impact Study is hereby agreed to and accepted, and its conclusions are adopted by the Planning Board insofar as they determine that there will not be any significant degradation in the level of service on the existing roads and intersections in and around the Project Site (Question 13(a) of EAF Part II).
17. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The mitigation measures proposed in the Traffic Impact Study are hereby agreed to and accepted and such measures will reduce the environmental impact of traffic being generated by the Project based on the analysis of the Town Engineer, the County DOT, and the NYS DOT. (Question 13(a) of EAF Part II).
18. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** While the Planning Board agrees with the NYS DOT decision to allow one point of ingress/egress to the Project Site, this is based on a 360,000 sq. ft. Building.
19. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** While the Applicant is proposing a paved parking lot for more than 406 cars (See Question 13(b) of the EAF Part II), the Planning Board accepts the explanation set forth in the Traffic Impact Study as to how traffic will be managed from the parking lot and based on the analysis of the Town Engineer, the County DOT and the State DOT. Further, the terms and conditions that restrict the hours of operation and proposed worker shifts to the times reflected in the Traffic Impact Study and the EAF shall be a condition of any Site Plan approval by the Planning Board.
20. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** The 122-acre site is large enough to provide sufficient space to accommodate and manage traffic on site so that vehicles can be taken off the roads quickly and avoid congestion on the public highways around the Project Site.
21. **FINDINGS and DETERMINATIONS:** While the Planning Board recognizes that the Building will require the heating and/or cooling of more than 100,000 sq. ft. of building (Question 14(d) of the EAF Part 2), the Project involves a warehouse and distribution center that will not require any abnormal or heavy energy loads and will use existing energy sources and distribution systems and will not require a new or upgraded substation.
22. **FINDINGS and DETERMINATION:** The Planning Board has reviewed the Lighting Plan provided by CHA (dated July 23, 2021) and agrees that it is “dark sky” compliant and will not have any spillage off of the Property.
23. **FINDINGS and DETERMINATION:** The Planning Board agrees with and hereby adopts the recommendations for modifications of the Site Plan that are proposed by the Onondaga County Planning Board, as set forth in its letter of August 4, 2021, which letter and rationale serves as a basis for the Planning Boards FINDINGS and DETERMINATIONS.
24. **FINDINGS and DETERMINATION:** The letters received by the Town Engineer from CHA, dated July 27, 2021, August 9, 2021 and August 10, 2021, answer the questions that resulted from the public hearings and posed by the Town Engineer in his letters, dated July 16, 2021 and August 5, 2021 and August 11, 2021 and such answers serve as a partial basis for the Planning Board’s FINDINGS and DETERMINATIONS.
25. **FINDING and DETERMINATION:** Each and every FINDING and DETERMINATION set forth herein can serve as a rational basis for the decision made in this Resolution and any FINDING and DETERMINATION can be severed from the rest if found incorrect, incomplete or insufficient by a court of competent jurisdiction.

BOARD MEMBERS AGREED TO FINDING AND DETERMINATION NOS 1 THROUGH 25

WHEREAS, on May 13, 2021 and continued on June 10, 2021 and July 8, 2021 the Planning Board held a public hearing on the Site Plan Package and to determine whether any additional information gained by the public would assist the Planning Board in its SEQRA determination;

WHEREAS, based on the public hearing(s), the Planning Board makes the following SUPPLEMENTAL FINDINGS and DETERMINATIONS:

1. TRAFFIC ON NYS RT 48

Concern was raised about accidents on NYS Rt. 48 and the traffic impacts the Project could cause to exacerbate the potential issues. The Planning Board has received the NYS DOT Letter, the County DOT Memo and an analysis by the Town Engineer and based on this information has determined that the Traffic Impact Study sufficiently addresses the concerns raised about the increase in traffic and any impacts resulting from said increase.

2. AQUIFER DISTURBANCE

Concern was raised that the disturbance of the vacant land will affect a drinking water aquifer below the surface of the Project Site. CHA has indicated in its correspondence to the Town Engineer that the Project Site is not over an aquifer and the nearest aquifer is located to the south of the Project Site. The Planning Board has determined that based on the soil type HSG 'D' (clay loam, silty clay loam, sandy clay, silty clay, or clay): Soils have high runoff potential and they have very low infiltration rates when thoroughly wetted, and consist chiefly of clay soils with a high swelling potential, soils with a permanent high water table, soils with a clay pan or clay layer at or near the surface, and shallow soils over nearly impervious material. These soils have a very low rate of water transmission (< 0.05 inches/hour) and as a result they will have minimal impact on the recharge of the groundwater aquifer near the surface of the Project Site (the Applicant is proposing to excavate approximately 8 feet at the Building and 16 feet at the stormwater facilities at the deepest point and the aquifer is estimated to be greater than 60' below grade).

3. GIDDINGS CREST SUBDIVISION IMPACT

Concern was raised that the Project will negatively impact the Giddings Crest subdivision homes primarily because of: (i) traffic, (ii) the height of the Building (40 ft), (iii) property values and (iv) drainage. Aside from the FINDINGS and DETERMINATIONS above, the Planning Board has further determined that (a) the noise related to any additional traffic on I-690 is an existing condition for the homes and as a result will not significantly change the current conditions; (b) the visual impact of the 40' high building will not be seen from the Giddings Crest subdivision as set forth in the FINDINGS and DETERMINATIONS above and therefore is not a significant environmental issue; (d) no evidence has been submitted that would show that the Project, situated on a properly zoned Industrial site, would affect property values of homes that are over .7 miles away, and (e) the Project Site (122.6 acres of which approximately 77% will be undisturbed) is large enough accommodate the drainage facilities that will be required, pursuant to the SWPPP and the Giddings Crest Subdivision is not a drainage tributary to the Project Site.

4. SEWER CAPACITY

Concern was raised that the Project would be an additional strain on the wastewater treatment and capacity in the Baldwinsville/Seneca Knolls treatment plant. The Planning Board has determined based on a letter from the Water Environmental Protection Department, dated March 25, 2021, that there is sufficient capacity at the treatment plant to accommodate the Project.

5. SOUND MITIGATION FROM ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC

Concern was raised that the additional truck traffic generated by the Project will increase the sound noise to the residents whose houses are situated east of I-690. The Planning Board has determined that I-690 is a State highway that was built to accommodate truck traffic and the residents who built or purchased homes adjacent to I-690 were aware, or should have been aware, of the potential for traffic noise.

6. IMPACTS ON THE THREE RIVERS WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREA

Concern was raised that the Project would generally have a negative environmental impact on the Three Rivers Wildlife Management Area. In addition to the FINDING and DETERMINATION made above, the Planning Board has determined that the bulk of the Three Rivers Wildlife Management Area is located over .5 mile(s) from the Project Site and that the physical distance between the Building, the existing vegetation and forested land and the buffering that will be required will mitigate any concerns about the environmental impacts to the Three Rivers Wildlife Management Area. Finally, there is no evidence of endangered or threatened species that would be significantly affected by the development of the Project either on the Project Site or near the Project Site. Therefore, the environmental impact on Three

Rivers Wildlife Management Area will be minimal. (See Exhibit D - United Auto Park Land Proximity prepared by the Town Engineer that provides context to this Supplemental Finding and Determination).

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that having reviewed the EAF and relating it to the criteria set forth in Section 617.8(c) of the SEQRA regulations, having held the public hearing and making the Findings and Determinations contained in this Resolution, the Planning Board hereby issues a Negative Declaration under Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law; and be it

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Lead Agency is the Planning Board of the Town of Lysander, with a mailing address of 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, Town of Lysander, New York;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Project is a Type I Action under SEQRA;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the proposed Action is located on Hencle Blvd and NYS Route 48 in the Town of Lysander;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Resolution be appended to the EAF Part II and Part III and made a part thereof;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Secretary to the Planning Board is hereby directed to file this Negative Declaration with the appropriate entities as set forth under 6 NYCRR Part 617.

Hugh Kimball questioned the project being situated on three separate parcels and asked if any Site Plan resolution can be conditioned upon those parcels being adjoined.

Mr. Frateschi stated that that would be an appropriate condition. Again, I believe that from a financing standpoint they are going to be required to do that anyway. A bank is not going to want to finance on three separate parcels.

William Lester stated that it's all ready listed in the proposed resolution, Item No. 6.

Steve Darcangelo posed a question to the Town Engineer, questioning the NYS DEC's response.

Mr. Yager stated that they would get back to us with any comments. The Field Staff of Three Rivers Wildlife Management Area directed me to it's Permit Division in Syracuse, we forwarded the site plan to them in June and we received no comments.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that his only assumption would be that they didn't have any.

Mr. Frateschi stated that they were given the opportunity to comment several times.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that he believes the application is pretty complete and there's nothing else to bring up

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Frateschi stated that the Board has now fulfilled your responsibility on the under the State Environmental Quality Review act and the Site Plan is now before you.

Mr. Corey stated that it is a site plan that we have looked at extensively. The question I would ask is do you see any reason why we shouldn't move forward and act on this?

Mr. Frateschi stated that he doesn't see any legal reason why you couldn't.

Mr. Corey posed the question to Mr. Yager as well.

Mr. Yager stated that we should add the condition noted in my review letter; as well as the condition of merging the three lots and anything else the Board would like to add; but from a Town Code and NYS Stormwater Regulation the proposed site plan I have no additional engineering comments.

Mr. Kimball stated that he has three items that he would like to talk about. It's not going to change how I vote, but I just think that it's a good time to raise them:

- 1) We have a problem in the Town on Brundage Road where a lot of trucking has been going on. They approach the brewery, they can't get in and they leave a mess. The only concern I have is will drivers have access to the restrooms at the warehouse site.

James Trasher, CHA, stated that the drivers will park on site, they won't park like they do on Brundage Road where they sit and wait to get it. They will be allowed in 100%. All deliveries are coordinated with the applicant, they will be allowed in.

Mr. Kimball stated that if they do leave a mess it will be on the applicant's property.

Mr. Trasher stated that I can tell you from the other facilities that are run and operated by United Auto, they're model property owners in Syracuse, Rotterdam, Albany, Niagara Falls, etc...

- 2) The second question I have relates to WEP and OCWA and the location of water and sewer lines, district expansions, etc... What is the status of that at this point in time.

Mr. Trasher stated that upon site plan approval we will work with the Town Engineer and Onondaga County as it relates to sanitary sewer and water connections. We will prepare Contract Drawings that will be submitted to the Town Engineer, reviewed and approved by the Town Board. We will see what the Town wants as far as the water and sewer districts. A Map Plan & Report will be prepared for the extension of those districts. We're willing to do whatever is needed or required. We've done the appropriate tests and have had the agencies both tell us the capacity on both and we're ready to move forward...

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if the parcel was in a district.

Mr. Yager stated that it is not.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if there is a district nearby.

Mr. Yager concurred.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if the intent is that it would be expanded or would a new district be formed.

Mr. Yager stated that it would be a district extension.

Mr. Trasher added that all fees for expansion will be paid for by the developer, water main...there is a 24-inch water main on our property so we may be in a water district.

Mr. Yager stated that the water main is on the eastern most parcel, which is the district boundary, technically because all three parcels are controlled by the same person now the district will be allowed to extend over the two parcels that are to the west of the parcel that is in the district.

- 3) The Onondaga County DOT has indicated no access on Hencle Blvd. I know you had asked at one point for at least an emergency access. I think that would be a good idea, not only for the developer but also for the safety of the firemen, ambulance crews or whoever has to go to this building. I don't know if we can do anything about that but I just feel that it's something that should be addressed. I know there are ways of doing it where emergency vehicles have some access to be able to open a gate or whatever... Obviously, it could not be used for normal traffic, trailers, trucks, but I think it's worth pursuing.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that if he understands what he has read from the State and DOT there is a request for turning lanes to be constructed and the applicant is agreeable to constructing those?

Mr. Trasher concurred stating that the required turn lanes and the traffic signal that they've asked for as part of the project will be part of the site plan approval. We will have Contract Drawings and permit drawings for the NYS Department of Transportation for that. There will be a right-hand turn lane into the site from the south to the north and from the north to the south there will be a left-hand turn lane with the appropriate driveway with the turn lanes that they wanted. The traffic signal will be installed all at the developer's expense.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if you are far enough along to obtain additional right-of-way in order to build those.

Mr. Trasher stated that they own most of the property on the east side of the road and then the width of the right-of-way...the only thing that may be in conflict will be the National Grid pole where we may have to relocate a pole along the proposed driveway entrance to put a signal pole; but that's just money with National Grid.

Mr. Darcangelo reiterated that your client has agreed to giving up the land that they may need.

Mr. Trasher: 100%.

Mr. Corey stated that every piece of mitigation we have discussed, whether it be the State, County or Town, the developer has agreed to.

Mr. Trasher concurred adding water main, sanitary sewer, landscaping, lighting...everything you guys have requested, the developer has done.

There is a letter on file dated August 11, 2021, prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, that will be read into the public record, in part:

I have completed my review of the Site Plans (final revision date of August 10, 2021), Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), dated August 2021 and State Environmental Quality Review Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF) Part 1 (final revision date of August 10, 2021, prepared by CHA Consulting and Traffic Impact Study (TIS), dated July 2021, prepared by GTS Consulting. The revised FEAF Part 1 accurately reflects the scope of the project shown in the revised site plans. At this time, it appears that the revised site plans & SWPPP are in compliance with all Town of Lysander and NYSDEC Stormwater requirements. The traffic mitigation measures proposed in the revised TIS and additional measures required by the NYS DOT will adequately address the anticipated traffic impacts associated with the project.

At this time, I would not be opposed to the Planning Board approving the revised site plan for the project as submitted with a condition that restricts the hours of operation and proposed worker shifts to the times reflected in the TIS and FEAF and that a wetland determination be obtained from the NYS DEC and ACOE.

Mr. Corey stated that the letter from the NYS DOT makes it very clear, as does our resolution and findings, that all of this approval is based on a one phase, 360,000 square foot project with the traffic as proposed. Any change in that will have to go back through the process, NYS DOT, the County and the Town, so it's going to be limited to that, period.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned hours of operation.

Mr. Yager stated 6:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. for shift one; 5:00 p.m. to 3:30 a.m. is shift two.

Mr. Darcangelo reiterated that it's not a 24-hour operation.

Mr. Trasher concurred stating that they close two hours a day for recharging based on how they're electric motors and those things work.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that vehicles will enter on the property there is enough area so that they can clear NYS Route 48 as they enter the site, both trucks and vehicles making sure there is no queuing up on 48. I think that's a critical element that be maintained, only because the build-up of traffic on 48 is what we're trying to avoid.

Mr. Corey stated that that is what the NYS DOT, County DOT and our Town Engineer talked about and shouldn't be a concern.

Mr. Trasher stated that the distance from NYS Route 48 onto the site is well over 500'. You can see the parking stalls for the trucks. If something was to queue up here it would be crazy. We would have loved to access Hencle, we don't have it at this time, but we have much bigger stacking potential here (indicating on plan).

Mr. Darcangelo concurred.

Mr. Corey stated that he is satisfied and can seriously consider a resolution for approval. We have discussed this, studied this and analyzed it.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if we have a resolution prepared for this evening.

Mr. Frateschi stated that he has drafted something over the course of the discussion. I anticipated that question and have something prepared...would you like me to read it?

Site Plan Approval for Ranalli ALA, LLC, which actually tracks what was in the SEQR resolution for the first two or three paragraphs; the resolution was worked on throughout the meeting with information and dates filled in as we went along.

**IN THE MATTER
Of
SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR
RANALLI ALA, LLC – UNITED AUTO
WAREHOUSE**

**Resolution 2021-007
Site Plan Approval
Motion by Darcangelo
Second by Lester**

The **TOWN PLANNING BOARD OF THE TOWN OF LYSANDER**, in the County of Onondaga, State of New York, met in regular session at the Town Hall in the Town of Lysander, located at 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York 13027, County of Onondaga, State of New York, on the 12thth day of August, 2021, at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was called to order by John B. Corey, as Chairman, and the following were present, namely:

| | |
|-------------------|----------|
| John B. Corey | Chairman |
| Hubert D. Kimball | Member |
| William Lester | Member |
| Steve Darcangelo | Member |

Absent: Doug Beachel, Member

WHEREAS, the Ranalli ALA LLC (the “Applicant”) originally proposed the construction of a 1 million square foot warehouse and distribution center at the intersection of Hencle Blvd., Oswego Road (Route 48) and I -690;

WHEREAS, on or about July 8, 2021, the Applicant revised the proposal and reduced the size of the building to 360,000 sq. ft (the “Building”) by eliminating the originally proposed Phase II and Phase III of the project (the revised proposal hereinafter referred to as the “Project”);

WHEREAS, the Applicant, through its engineers (CHA Engineers), has submitted a site plan package (the “Site Plan Package”) entitled “Proposed Warehouse, 8626 Oswego Road, Town of Lysander, New York,” prepared by CHA, which consists of the following Sheets: C-001 Title Sheet, C-003 Existing Conditions, C-100 Overall Layout, C-101 Site Layout, C-102 Site Layout, C-200 Overall Grading, C-201 Site Grading, C-202 Site Grading, C-203 Site Grading, C-204 Site Grading, C-300 Overall Utility Plan, C-301 Site Utility Plan, C-302 Site Utility Plan, C-303 Site Utility Plan, C-400 Landscaping Plan, C-500 Overall Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, C-551 Erosion Control Details, C-601 Details, C-602 Details, C-603 Details, C-604 Details, C-700 Lighting Plan, C-701 Lighting Details, C-702 Lighting Details, identified as Project No. 23278.9074, and dated 3-17-21, last revision date 8-10-21;

WHEREAS, on August 12, 2021, the Planning Board approved a resolution issuing a negative declaration under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (the “SEQRA Resolution”);

WHEREAS, the Planning Board received a Site Plan review letter from the Town Engineer, dated August 11, 2021 indicating that he has reviewed the Site Plan Package and believes it conforms to New York State law and the Town Code;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that having issued a negative declaration under SEQRA and having reviewed the Site Plan Package and comparing it to the criteria set forth in Town Code 320-41 (Site Plan Criteria) the Planning Board approves the Site Plan Package subject to the following conditions:

1. All the Site Plan conditions set forth in the SEQRA Resolution, including, but not limited to: traffic mitigation requested by NYS DOT, the modifications and comments set forth in the Syracuse Onondaga County Planning Board’s Resolution, all recommendations of the Town Engineer set forth in his review letters, the recommendations and restrictions set forth in the Onondaga County Memo, **are hereby approved and adopted**;
2. A wetland determination letter from the New York State Department of Conservation and the Army Corp of Engineers must be submitted to the Town Engineer that verifies the boundaries on the Wetland Delineation Report submitted by the Applicant, dated April 15th, 2021;
3. The extension of the appropriate sewer and water district to the Project Site must be approved by the Town Board;
4. Hours of operation shall be as set forth in the Traffic Impact Study and the Environmental Assessment Form, since they were partially relied on to make the SEQRA determination (Finding and Determination 19 in the SEQRA Resolution);
5. Final review and approval of the Town Engineer and the Planning Board Attorney on the Site Plan Package, the Stormwater Pollution and Prevention Plan and any subsequent documents submitted by the Applicant that does not materially change the Site Plan;

6. The three parcels set forth in Part I or the EAF (tax map - 055-01-19.1; 055-01-18; 055-01-20.0) be merged into one parcel before a certificate of occupancy is issued.
7. Conditions set forth in the Town Engineer's Site Plan approval letter dated August 11, 2021.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Darcangelo stated that this is a big project and he believes the Board has thought about a lot of these important elements.

Mr. Corey stated that there's no question from where we started to where we ended up.

Mr. Trasher thanked the Board for their time.

IV. ADJOURN

RESOLUTION #8 -- Motion by Kimball, Second by Lester

RESOLVED, that the Thursday, August 12, 2021 regular Planning Board meeting adjourn at 8:18 p.m.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Rice, Clerk