

TOWN OF LYSANDER  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
8220 LOOP ROAD  
Thursday, April 8, 2021 @ 7:00 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Town of Lysander Planning Board was held Thursday, April 8, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. and the Lysander Town Building, 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Hugh Kimball and Doug Beachel

OTHERS PRESENT: Tim Frateschi, Esq, Planning Board; Tim Coyer, Ianuzi-Romans Angelo Vecchio; Frank Costanzo, Zoning Board of Appeals; Kevin Rode; James Trasher, CHA and Karen Rice, Clerk

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

I. PUBLIC HEARING -- None Scheduled

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Review and approval of the minutes of the March 11, 2021 regular Planning Board meeting.

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

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the March 11, 2021 regular Planning Board meeting be approved as submitted.

3 Ayes -- 0 Noes

III. OLD BUSINESS

- |                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Controlled Site Use | Ranalli ALA, LLC         |
| Case No. 2021—002      | Hencle Blvd/NYS Route 48 |

John Corey, Chairman, stated that if there's anyone who came this evening to ask questions or talk about the project, please be advised that this is not a Public Hearing. What we plan on doing tonight is review Part 2 of the Long EAF and work toward a POSITIVE or NEGATIVE DECLARATION; and depending on how that goes our next step would be to schedule the Public Hearing. At that time anyone and everyone is welcomed to come and ask any questions of the Developer and Board at that time. If there is anyone here who has some kind of question that they feel is critical to know something tonight, I will be happy to stay after the meeting and provide discussion with them. For the purpose of what we're doing here, this is not a Public Hearing. The Board appreciates your understanding.

Tim Frateschi, Esq., stated for the record that his firm was retained to provide for legal services for one of the smaller property owners who is going to be selling the property. I just found out this information today. I told my partner, who is representing them, that we can't do that because that would be a conflict. I just want it on the record that we're no longer representing them.

Mr. Frateschi stated that before we start going through Part 2, I want to put into context what we're doing and why. The applicant submitted Part 1, Project and Setting. The Planning Board has already declared themselves Lead Agency for this project. Because the project will disturb more than ten acres it is considered a Type I Action under SEQR; which is why we're going through the Long Environmental Assessment form. When we go through Part 2 it relates back to Part 1. Every question that is in Part 2 should have an answer in Part 1. I've gone through everything and a good sense of the project and a good sense of what the State would require; which is a Finding of either a Significant or Non-significant Impact. I'm going to go through it and ask the Board what their thoughts are.

**IMPACT ON LAND:**

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

Yes, a 1,007,500 square foot warehouse distribution center is being built on 122 acres. The proposal is to disturb 50 or so acres of that 122 acres, so keep that in context. The property that is going to be disturbed is less than half of the entire site.

In reviewing a through h, the Board finds the impact to be: No, small impact may occur; with the exception of d; The proposed action may involve the excavation and removal or more than 1,000 tons of natural material which will be a moderate to large impact may occur. The topsoil will be moved off site.

**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

**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

In reviewing a through k, the board finds the impact to be: No, small impact may occur. However, in Phase 3 there is a road that may encroach on a 100' buffer of a wetland. The applicant has indicated that if during Phase 3 they need to move that road out of the buffer zone they would, so that would be a mitigating way not to impact the wetland.

**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

**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.

**IMPACTS ON AIR**

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

**IMPACT ON PLANTS AND ANIMALS:**

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

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.

#### **IMPACT ON AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES:**

8) The proposed action may impact agricultural resources. NO

The property has been farmed in the past, however it is an Industrial site.

#### **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

#### **IMPACT ON HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES:**

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

#### **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

#### **IMPACT ON CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL AREAS:**

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

#### **IMPACT ON TRANSPORTATION:**

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

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 for correspondence from the County and State DOT.

#### **IMPACT ON ENERGY:**

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

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.

#### **IMPACT ON NOISE, ODOR AND LIGHT:**

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

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

#### **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

#### **CONSISTENCY WITH COMMUNITY PLANS**

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

#### **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 based on the answers to Part 2, my recommendation would be to authorize me to draft a resolution for the next meeting. Based on the answers I'm seeing here I think the recommendation would be a NEGATIVE DECLARATION under SEQR.

Board members concurred.

There was some discussion with regard to the Board's LEAD AGENCY status.

Karen Rice, Clerk, stated that a coordinated review was held March 22, 2021, with the exception of NYS DOT wanted to weigh-in on the project when the time comes, nobody else responded or asked to be LEAD AGENCY.

Mr. Frateschi stated that he will have a resolution prepared for the Board to review and make a decision on at the next meeting, Thursday, May 13, 2021.

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

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing be held at a date and time designated by the secretary, on the application of Ranalli ALA, LLC, on property located at the intersection of Hencle Boulevard and NYS Route 48/Oswego Road, Tax Map Nos. 055.-01-19.1, 18.0 and 20.0, Baldwinsville, New York, for a Controlled Site Use to allow the construction of a Warehouse.

3 Ayes -- 0 Noes

The application was forwarded to the Onondaga County Planning Board for their review and recommendation. It will be heard on April 21, 2021.

Mr. Trasher thanked the Board for their time.

## IV. NEW BUSINESS

- |                      |                 |
|----------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Minor Subdivision | Axtell, George  |
| Case No. 2021—003    | 3626 Doyle Road |

Tim Coyer, Ianuzi-Romans, represented the applicant in his proposal to subdivide a 3.38-acre parcel into two residential building lots, one fronting Doyle Road, the other fronting Olive Drive. This property was before the Board in 2018 for subdivision approval for estate purposes of Lot 1, with an existing residential home on it and left an L shaped lot as the remnant piece. The owner of this parcel is interested in building his home on the proposed lot fronting Olive Drive with 2.46 acres. There is an approved septic system for Lot 2B (proposed home). Lot 2A, .86 acres, will remain vacant until it's sold; however, we're in the process of getting an approved septic system for Lot 2A. We are here this evening to set the Public Hearing.

There was some discussion with regard to the lot size of the remnant piece, as it's just under the AR-40 zoning regulation of 40,000 square foot lot.

Mr. Coyer stated that he will make that change.

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

RESOLVED, That the Planning Board having followed the prescribed SEQR procedures and having received no comments to the contrary, hereby designates itself as Lead Agency for **GEORGE AXTELL**, 3626 Doyle Road, also known as 3176 Olive Drive, Baldwinsville, New York Minor Subdivision application.

3 Ayes -- 0 Noes

The applicant has completed Part I, Project Information; John Corey, Chairman, reviewed Part Two—Environmental Assessment, with the board.

1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations? No
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land? No
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community? No
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)? N/A
5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway? No
6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities? No
7. Will the proposed action impact existing:
  - a. public / private water supplies? No
  - b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities? No
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological,

architectural or aesthetic resources? No

9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, water bodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)? No

10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems? No

11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health? No

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

RESOLVED, that having reviewed the SEQR regulations, determined this is an UNLISTED ACTION, and having reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment form, and finding no significant or adverse impacts resulting from the **GEORGE AXTELL**, 3626 Doyle Road, also known as 3176 Olive Drive, Baldwinsville, New York, Minor Subdivision application, the Planning Board issues a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**.

3 Ayes -- 0 Noes:

**RESOLUTION #5** -- Motion by Corey, Second by Darcangelo

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing be held at a date and time designated by the secretary, on the application of **GEORGE AXTELL**, for a subdivision of property located at 3626 Doyle Road, also known as 3176 Olive Drive, Baldwinsville, New York, Tax Map No. 069.-02-05 & 07, for a development of one (1) additional lot from a parcel of approximately 3 ½ acres.

3 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Coyer thanked the Board for their time.

V. **OTHER BUSINESS**

1. Major Subdivision—Final Plat      Highland Meadows/Lysander Preserve  
Lots 28 & 32, Giddings Trail

Karen Rice, Clerk, stated that the proposed Final Plat is consistent with the Preliminary Plat, the Board is in a position to approve Final Plat approval for Lots 28 & 32, Giddings Trail.

**RESOLUTION #6** -- Motion by Lester, Second by Darcangelo

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board authorizes the Chairperson to review the Final Plat for the two (2) lot subdivision application of Highland Meadows Development, LLC, for property located at Highland Meadows, Phase 3E, Lots 28 & 32 Giddings Trail, Part of Farm Lots No. 78 & 79, Part of Tax Map Number 049.2-03-06.4 and finding that all modifications and conditions have been met; and that the Final Plat is consistent with the approved Preliminary Plat; and that any differences found are not significant; the Board authorizes the Chairperson to waive the Final Plat Public Hearing and sign the Final Plat.

3 Ayes -- 0 Noes

VI. **ADJOURN**

**RESOLUTION #7** -- Motion by Darcangelo, Second by Lester

RESOLVED, that the April 8, 2021 regular Lysander Planning Board meeting adjourn at 7:55 p.m.

3 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Rice, Clerk  
Planning Board

