

TOWN OF LYSANDER  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
8220 Loop Road  
Thursday, November 9, 2023 @ 7:00 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Town of Lysander Planning Board was held Thursday, November 9, 2023 at 7:00 p.m. at the Lysander Town Building, 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Corey; Hugh Kimball, Steve Darcangelo and Doug Beachel

MEMBERS ABSENT: Matt Hunt

OTHERS PRESENT: Al Yager, Town Engineer; Tony Paone; Pat Reynolds, Ianuzzi & Romans; Kevin McCord, William Massaro, Belgium Cold Springs Fire Department; Peter Hansen; Peter Pandori; Andra Pandori; Rick Ravas; Steve Sehnert, Applied Earth Technologies; Jeanette Tyler; Katy Kiley; Ermi Ortlieb and Karen Rice, Clerk

**AMEND RESOLUTION #7 OF THE OCTOBER 12, 2023 PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

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

RESOLVED that Resolution No. 5 of the October 12, 2023 Planning Board meeting be amended to include both 2185 and 2190 West Genesee Road, Baldwinsville, New York.

3 Ayes -- 0 Noes

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

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Minor Subdivision<br>Case No. 2023-010 | Pandori, Peter and Andrea<br>NYS Route 370/West Genesee Road |
|---|--|

The Public Hearing opened at 7:01 p.m.

John Corey, Chairman, reviewed the application of Peter and Andrea Pandori for their three (3) lot Minor Subdivision of property located at 2185 and 2190 West Genesee Road, Baldwinsville, New York.

Lot 1, 1.66 acres; Lot 2 1.61 acres and Lot 3 1.43 acres

Ermi Ortlieb, 2200 Connell Terrace, stated that the Town Engineer may remember her regarding a drainage issue in Indian Spring; stating that drainage is still a concern. I was told before that they were going to propose changing the drainage coming down from the Lysander Preserve Subdivision, which is also adjacent to this parcel to the Seneca River. Question: Is that drainage going to be rerouted?

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that it will not be rerouted, but we would like to do some cleaning in that swale. There are some issues with the easements behind the houses on Connell Terrace that we do need to work through with the Town Board to have access there to do the cleaning of that ditch. The whole Indian Springs Neighborhood should have a Drainage District and I know that that has been...

Mrs. Ortlieb: Contentious

Mr. Yager concurred, stating that it has been quoted in the past and it was not supported by the residents. There is a need for it up there though and I think as the neighborhood ages the need gets bigger. It is a problem; it is a problem to spend public funds on private property that provide a benefit to a private property owner. We can talk about that offline a little bit because I don't know if it necessarily affects this subdivision per say because the easement is already filed. We just don't have a funding mechanism to do the work.

Mrs. Ortlieb questioned if the drainage will be affected further because of the new building lots proposed.

Mr. Yager stated that no it would not because the easement is still shown. They would not be able to build into it and/or block it up in any way. There is an easement there, we just don't

have a funding mechanism to do anything with that easement. It is a Town easement we just don't have a way to spend money on it.

Mrs. Ortlieb questioned the egress of these parcels, West Genesee Road?

Mr. Yager concurred; the easement is on the west end of their parcel. Their driveway wouldn't be allowed to be in the easement, their house wouldn't be allowed in the easement. The easement would remain.

Mrs. Ortlieb questioned water service.

Mr. Yager stated that water is not available. They do have sewer that front the lots so they can connect with grinder pumps into that Sanitary Sewer Force Main that exists today and have sewer lots. They would have to drill wells to have water. The other option is for somebody to construct the water main from Connell Terrace through an easement and run a water main down to 370, put a hydrant in and tie back into that 2" water main on West Genesee. That 2" water main does not have adequate flow to serve three additional lots as it stands right now. Quite frankly, today's development standards that 2" main would not be allowed. You would have to have fire service available on that main.

Mrs. Ortlieb concurred stating that that was the same problem with Lysander Preserve and the pressure issue as well.

Mr. Yager stated that the pressure isn't an issue there, it's just flow because they only have a 2" main on 370 from Dexter Parkway west, with no hydrants and a low flow for that number of houses.

Jeanette Tyler asked for clarification as to where they could tie in on Connell Terrace because she lives on Connell Terrace.

Mr. Yager stated that this would be something that whoever develops the property or develops the lots and they want public water they would have to negotiate an easement between existing lots to run a water main from Connell Terrace down to serve the three new lots, install a hydrant and connect back in to the 2" water main that fronts those lots on West Genesee. It's not something that the Town would do. It is not something that the Town funds. It is something that needs to be borne by the Developer. At this point in time the applicant hasn't proposed that. The lots are plenty big enough to have wells drilled on them. There aren't sanitary sewer issues because the Indian Springs neighborhood is served by sanitary sewers and these lots will be served by sanitary sewers. There is adequate ground water supply in that area. I don't anticipate that whoever builds houses on those lots will have an issue with obtaining an adequate ground water source.

Ms. Tyler questioned if they could negotiate at a later date to tap in.

Mr. Yager concurred stating that is theoretically possible but highly unlikely. It's a significant cost. Probably very close to six figures.

Ms. Tyler questioned if there is a height restriction.

The property is zoned R-12.5 with a height restriction of no higher than 30'.

Mr. Yager stated that there's quite a grade behind those homes on Connell Terrace, from the top of the proposed lots down to 370 (unclear) there's quite a bit of grade there. You would probably see some rooftops; I don't think you'd necessarily see the whole house. I don't think anybody on Connell Terrace mows all the way...there's still some trees on everybody's lawn up there. So, there will still be a tree line separation between the proposed houses.

Ms. Tyler stated that she's just curious because it's steep...

Mr. Yager stated that that is one of his concerns in his review. I think topography needs to be provided with this subdivision map, one to verify that the driveways can be constructed with less than a 10% grade and that they'll be able to provide positive drainage improvements away from the homes just because of the steepness.

Ms. Tyler stated that their homes sit up above, how to prevent...

Mr. Yager stated that erosion control during construction is going to be part of the building permit process, not part of the subdivision process. They don't have to disturb the whole acre to construct a home.

The Public Hearing closed at 7:13 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING -- 7:05 p.m.

2. Minor Subdivision  
Case No. 2023—012

Ravas, Richard & Christine  
8719 Smokey Hollow Road

The Planning Board declared themselves Lead Agency at the last Planning Board meeting but did not have the opportunity to review the Short Environmental Assessment form, which is a requirement prior to opening the Public Hearing.

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 #2 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Beachel

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 8719 Smokey Hollow Road, Baldwinsville, New York, Minor Subdivision application, the Planning Board issues a NEGATIVE DECLARATION.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

The Public Hearing opened at 7:17 p.m.

Steve Sehnert, Licensed Land Surveyor, represented the applicant in his proposal to subdivide a 5+/- acre parcel into two lots. The applicant went before the Zoning Board of Appeals seeking relief on the minimum Lot Width required on a Collector Road. That variance was granted on October 2, 2023. The parcel 460' of lot width, Lot 1 containing 260' of lot width with their home, out-buildings and 2.83 acres and Lot 2 containing 200' of lot width ,is vacant and 2.17 acres for future development. A sewage disposal plan has been designed and approved for Lot 2. The

property is surrounded by wetlands and across the street from the Three Rivers Game Management Area.

The Public Hearing closed at 7:19 p.m.

## II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Review and approval of the minutes of the October 12, 2023 regular Planning Board meetings.

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

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the October 12, 2023 regular Planning Board Meeting be approved as submitted.

2 Ayes -- 2 Abstain (Darcangelo & Beachel were not present at the October 12, 2023 meeting)

This action did not receive a majority and will be tabled until the December 14, 2023 Planning Board meeting.

## III. OLD BUSINESS

1. Minor Subdivision  
Case No. 2023-010

Pandori, Peter and Andrea  
NYS Route 370/West Genesee Road

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that he doesn't believe the Board is in a position to take action on this application. The Final Plat has not been supplied yet, so I don't know that we are able to take any further action this evening.

John Corey, Chairman, concurred, stating that he'd like to read the Town Engineer's comments into the record:

I have completed my review of the Sketch Plan for the Pandori NYS Route 370/West Genesee Road Subdivision, prepared by Applied Earth Technologies, dated October 11, 2023. I do have some concerns with the existing grades on the lots and the ability to construct a home with a driveway that meets the maximum 10% grade allowed by the Town Code and provide positive drainage away from the home. I would recommend that the Planning Board require the applicant provide draft grading plans for the lots prior to approving this subdivision.

Mr. Yager added that obviously footprints from the homes could change and what not, but the driveways sometimes cannot. It's important to know that the lots can support it. Thank you, Folks.

This item will be tabled until December 14, 2023.

2. Minor Subdivision  
Case No. 2023—012

Ravas, Richard & Christine  
8719 Smokey Hollow Road

Steve Darcangelo questioned what the Area Variance was for.

Karen Rice, Clerk, stated Lot Width. The property is zoned Agricultural, which requires a 200' lot width, but under the Highway Overlay Controls we ask for an additional 50' on Collector roads. Smokey Hollow Road is a Collector Road.

There is a letter on file dated November (9), 2023, prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, that will be read into the record, in part:

I have completed my review of the plat map for the Ravas Smokey Hollow Road Minor Subdivision, prepared by Applied Earth Technologies, dated October 31, 2023. 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.

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

RESOLVED, that having reviewed the Minor Subdivision application, as defined on a map dated October 31, 2023, prepared by Steve Sehnert, Licensed Land Surveyor, associated with the application of Richard and Christine Ravas, 109 Smokey Hollow Road, Baldwinsville, New York, for property located at 8719 Smokey Hollow Road, Tax Map No. 055.-01-04.2, Baldwinsville, New York is hereby approved.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

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

RESOLVED, that in granting a subdivision to Richard and Christine Ravas, for property located at 8719 Smokey Hollow Road, Baldwinsville, New York, the Planning Board invokes its right to impose a fee of \$250.00 per lot for one (1) lot in lieu of land for the development of parks, playgrounds, recreation or open land areas in the Town.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

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. Sehnert thanked the Board for the time.

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

- |                      |                  |
|----------------------|------------------|
| 1. Minor Subdivision | McCord,, Kevin   |
| Case No. 2023-013    | 1095 Lamson Road |

Kevin McCord stated that he is representing his mother, Judith McCord, who owns property at 1095 Lamson Road. A letter of acknowledging representation is on file. This subdivision is pretty cut and dry. My mother wants to get her affairs in order for Estate purposes between my brothers and me. I will receive Lot 1 with 11+/- acres, barn and out-buildings and Lot 2 23.466 with the home outbuildings and 23.466 acres going to my two brothers. There is a barn that straddles Lots 2 and 3 that will be coming down since it does not meet the required setbacks. That's pretty much it as I have a residence out in Cato and have no plans to build a home.

John Corey, Chairman, stated that it's basically just to get your mother's Estate in order with no plans to build.

Mr. McCord concurred stating that there are not changes. We do hunt on the property and have a small animal farm. Hopefully, she will be around for another 20 years, but it was suggested after our father's passing that we get the property out of her name. Our parent's wish was to give us each a parcel. I will take mine now, my brothers will be on the deed with the home with our Mom having life use.

**RESOLUTION #6** -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

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 Kevin McCord, 1095 Lamson Road, Phoenix, New York Minor Subdivision application.

4 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

Hugh Kimball stated that he was looking at Pictometry picture of the property and it indicated a straight line perhaps a ditch or something coming down on the right-hand side of the property and seemed to turn to the right and go parallel...it looked like a ditch or something, maybe a fence. It's quite visible on Pictometry.

Mr. McCord stated that there's a hedgerow line that comes down through, with old apple trees. There are old farm fences throughout the property. Where was this picture, Google Maps?

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that you can find it on the Onondaga County's GIS Website.

Steve Darcangelo stated that in some subdivision we require perc tests, and others we don't. is one required for this property.

Mr. Yager stated that the map will not be filed as an approved building lot.

Karen Rice, Clerk, stated that it's the size of the lot also, anything over a certain size doesn't have to be perked with a notation on the plan.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if we should comment on the 4 to 1 ratio.

Mr. Yager stated that the Board has the discretion...it's a recommendation, not a requirement.

#### RESOLUTION #7 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

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 Kevin McCord, 1095 Lamson Road, Phoenix, New York, Minor Subdivision application, the Planning Board issues a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes:

#### RESOLUTION #8 -- 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 Kevin McCord, for a subdivision of property located at 1095 Lamson Road, Phoenix, New York, Tax Map No. 016.-03-18.4, for a two-lot subdivision from a parcel of approximately 35 acres.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. McCord thanked the Board for their time.

Pat Reynolds, Ianuzi-Romans, represented the applicant, 8269 – 8289 Loop Road, stating that the parcel is 2.9 acres in size in the Radisson Corporate Park with a 3200-sf office building and associated parking. The existing parking count is at 24 parking spaces. As far as the existing office building, it is split in half between two uses; one-half of the building is being used as a Healthcare Facility that has four employees on-site at any given time and 15 clients per day visiting the site. Their hours are 8:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. The second half of the building is currently being used by Kolden Fire and Rescue. They are providing sales and service of fire and rescue equipment. They have two employees with 9:00 to 5:00 office hours Monday through Friday. We are proposing a 10,000-sf building to be utilized by them as more of their service department for fire apparatus and rescue vehicles. We are not proposing any additional parking spaces however we are adding a significant amount of asphalt to allow for them maneuvering the equipment. With this application we are not proposing any new signs. We are going to be using the existing services already on the site as far as sanitary, water and gas. We are proposing four lights on the southside of the building and overhead doors. The plans do not show the Isolines, but it is certainly easy enough that we can add on there. There is existing landscaping around the existing building that will be refinished and cleaned up. We are not proposing any landscaping around the new building at this time.

Hugh Kimball questioned what kind of waste would be generated in the new facility, oil, or anything like that.

Mr. Reynolds stated that he would imagine there would be a certain amount of oil that will be generated as waste. I don't have the specific details of that, but I imagine it would work like any other shop with a waste container until it can be picked up by a recycling company.

Steve Darcangelo questioned if there is a need for a dumpster.

Anthony Paone, 8269 – 8289 Loop Road, stated that there are two small dumpsters there right now for daily trash. The Mental Healthcare facility has minimal waste. Kolden Fire and Rescue has fire hand tools and jaws of life sort of stock that service all their dealers out of the Upstate and CNY areas. Other than that, in my opinion, it's not necessary.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if there were any wetlands associated with this site.

Mr. Reynolds stated not in the back of this site.

Mr. Yager concurred stating that it's pretty dry actually. As you go further to the north and west behind the Gypsum Express Site it gets wet.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if the parking spaces indicated is enough for the existing as well as the proposed building.

Mr. Yager stated that they exceed the parking requirement, as we would consider this a warehouse space, which only requires one space for each 5,000 square feet, so technically you only need two parking places.

Mr. Darcangelo reiterated that it's a warehouse and not a mechanic shop?

Mr. Paone stated that it's basically both.

Mr. Yager stated that this would fall more under a warehouse type use, they are going to do repairs, but when you look at it it's not a high volume.

Mr. Paone concurred stating that it's not a sales or retail facility. They have a 100,000 square foot facility in the Buffalo area, that is where their big service facility is.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if access off of Loop is appropriate.

Mr. Yager stated that it looks awfully wide to me. I don't see any problem with it.

Mr. Paone stated that the parking is 140' deep and fans out by 110' going north to south. Again, we'll probably maintain the same distance from where the parking lot is straight back.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that he realizes it's not a high-volume road and/or building but will we have cars queued up to leave?

Mr. Paone stated that he has been in and out many times with two vehicles at a time without any problem.

Mr. Yager stated that he believes it's 30'...it's a wide driveway so I wouldn't be concerned.

Hugh Kimball stated that the RCA tends to be a little fussy about how things are maintained. I notice the parking lot and driveway look pretty broken up.

Mr. Paone stated that we've already got proposals to dig up the driveway and put in a whole new driveway in all the way to the back.( Empire State Development) has been very cooperative on this project.

There is a letter on file dated October 26, 2023, prepared by Empire State Development Corporation, that will be made part of the public record, in part:

This is to acknowledge receipt of the site plan drawings for 8269 Loop Road. The plans were drawn by Ianuzi & Romans Land Surveying, P.C. and are dated October 20, 2023. The Plan sets forth a proposed new building 80' x 128' totaling 10,240 sq. ft.

This letter serves as verification that the site plan drawings have been reviewed and approved by ESD. The plan meets the requirements of the Radisson Corporate Park Development Controls of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) and the Radisson Declaration of Protective Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions.

There is a letter on file dated October 26, 2023, prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, that will be made part of the public record, in part:

This is to acknowledge receipt of the Site Plan drawings for 8269 Loop Road. The plans were drawn by Ianuzi-Romans Land Surveying, P.C. and are dated October 20, 2023. The plan sets forth a proposed new building 80' x 128' totaling 10,240 sq ft.

This letter serves as verification that the site plan drawings have been reviewed and approved by ESD. The plan meets the requirements of the Radisson Corporate Park Development Controls for the Planned Unit Development (PUD) and the Radisson Declaration of Protective Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions.

There is a letter on file dated November (9), 2023, prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, that will be made part of the public record, in part:

I have completed my review of the most recent site plan drawings, dated October 12, 2023, prepared by Ianuzi & Romans Land Surveying, P.C. and SEQR for the 8269 Loop Road Site plan Amendment project. My review generated the following comments that the Planning Board will need to consider prior to moving forward with approvals related to this project.

Site Plan Review Comments:

- The size and occupancy of the building will require the proposed building to have sprinklers. OCWA will need to verify that the existing water service lateral that is proposed to be used for this building is sized adequately prior to a building permit being issued.
- A site lighting plan will need to be provided by the applicant to verify that light will not project outside the property boundary.
- A sanitary sewer lateral manhole connection detail will need to be included in the site plan.
- The proposed limit of clearing will need to be added to the site plan.
- It is recommended that the applicant extend the existing storm sewer on the site through the proposed parking area to ensure that stormwater is efficiently conveyed from the new impervious surfaces to the roadside drainage.

At this time, I would not be opposed to the Planning Board granting approval of the site plan amendment contingent on the comments above being addressed with the building permit submission.



Mr. Darcangelo stated that the comment about the parking lot is kind of critical because it looks like what you're doing including that parking lot is over an acre.

Mr. Paone stated that it's not...

Mr. Yager asked if just asphalt is being taken off and repaving.

Mr. Paone concurred.

Mr. Yager stated that if you leave the stone in place it doesn't constitute as soil disturbance.

Mr. Paone stated that they have received opinions a couple different ways instead of digging it up. It would be more cost effective to shim and top...

Mr. Yager stated that if it was him he'd mill it. You don't have to replace the subbase materials, what's under the parking lot is fine. They either need to build the surface up or shim and top. It's just weathered surface.

Mr. Paone stated that there's about an \$80,000 price difference. We're going to bring a mill in, apply stone and shim. They also talked about the option to milling everything and leave the base. We agree with that.

**RESOLUTION #9** -- Motion by Corey, Second by Beachel

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 (Name of Applicant/Project), (Property Address), (Name of Action) application.

4 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

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if there was anyway this facility could be built over an existing right-of-way to OCWA?

Karen Rice, Clerk, stated that it was abandoned.

Mr. Paone concurred. Originally the site back when Paul Fowler developed it for the original owner it was supposed to be four identical office buildings at 3200 sf. For whatever reason OCWA put in that large right-of-way, but it was never used. We got it abandoned because we were never going to use the original site plan. Per one of Mr. Yager's comments in his review letter, it's 8 inches coming in, and reduces to 6.

Mr. Yager stated that you should be more than adequate, you may be able to reduce it to 4 for a 10,000-sf building.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that it shows 'partially abandoned'.

Mr. Reynolds indicated on the plan what portion has been abandoned.

**RESOLUTION #10** -- Motion by Corey, Second by Darcangelo

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 8269 – 8289 Loop Road, 8269 Loop Road Site Plan application, the Board issues a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

**FINDINGS:**

Review of the Short Environmental Assessment form indicates that there will be no significant or adverse impacts resulting from the.

There is a letter on file from the Empire State Development Corporation, dated October 26, 2023, stating that they have reviewed the application and it conforms with the rules and regulations in the Radisson PUD.

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

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

This action did not require referral to the Onondaga County Planning Board for their review and recommendation.

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

**RESOLUTION #11** -- Motion by Corey, Second by Beachel

RESOLVED, that having reviewed the site plan as defined on a map dated October 20, 2023, prepared by Ianuzi & Romans Land Surveying, P.C. associated with the application of 8269 ~ 8289 Loop Road, 8269 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York and part of the Radisson PUD, to allow the construction of an 80' x 128' Facility to allow the Fire Truck Repair and Service, the site plan is hereby approved, with the following conditions, if any:

- 1) Comments in the Engineer's letter dated November 9, 2023 are to be addressed prior to the issuance of a building permit.

**DISCUSSION:**

Steve Darcangelo reiterated that there's no requirement for Stormwater Management even after the fact, so water coming off of this roof and new paving is not required to be retained.

Mr. Yager stated that it is not because it's not disturbing more than 40,000 sf, so there is not a requirement to do that during or after construction.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Paone and Mr. Reynolds thanked the Board for their time.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Waive Hearing/Sign Final Plat Timber Banks Subdivision

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that he has reviewed each of the Final Plats presented this evening and find that there are no significant changes. Section 6 has been reduced, so one less lot that previously included.

**Waive Hearing/Sign Final Plat Timber Banks, Section 3, Phase 3**

**RESOLUTION #12** -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board authorizes the Chairperson to review the Final Plat for the twenty-one (21) lot subdivision application of J Alberici & Sons for property located at Timber Banks, Sedge Grass Road, Section No. 3, Phase 3, Lots 322 ~ 343, Part of Farm Lot No. 88 and Part of Tax Map Number 072.01-01-08.1, and finding that all modifications and conditions have been met; and that the Final Plat in 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.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

**Waive Hearing/Sign Final Plat Timber Banks, Section 3, Phase 5**

**RESOLUTION #13** -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board authorizes the Chairperson to review the Final Plat for the nineteen (19) lot subdivision application of J Alberici & Sons for property located at Timber Banks, Tall Tree Lane, Section No. 3, Phase 5, Lots as identified on a map dated April 29, 2022, revised October 19, 2023, Part of Farm Lot No. 88 and Part of Tax Map Number 072.01-01-08.1, and finding that all modifications and conditions have been met; and that the Final Plat in 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.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

**Waive Hearing/Sign Final Plat Timber Banks, Section 3, Phase 6**

**RESOLUTION #14** -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board authorizes the Chairperson to review the Final Plat for the nineteen (19) lot subdivision application of J Alberici & Sons for property located at Timber Banks, Forest Ridge Lane, Section No. 3, Phase 6, Lots as identified on a map dated April 29, 2022, Part of Farm Lot No. 88 and Part of Tax Map Number 072.01-01-08.1, and finding that all modifications and conditions have been met; and that the Final Plat in 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.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

2. Recommendation to Town Board: Whispering Oaks, Section IV:  
Relief from IZ Condition Lot 25, 2100 Harkins Lane

Karen Rice, Clerk, stated that Dan Bargabos, Heritage Homes, has a customer who would like to construct their home on Lot 25, Harkins Lane, Whispering Oaks, Section IV. The lot is a corner lot at Harkins Lane and Emerick Road. A 100' x 249'96' of that lot is set aside for a Vegetative Buffer per the Incentive Zoning Negotiations. Mr. Bargabos is seeking relief of approximately 10' of that buffer so that his customer can have a side loading garage where the driveway would encroach into that buffer. It was my thought that this would be a Town Board function, as they are the Board that approved the Incentive Zoning of this property. I emailed the Planning Board Members, Town Engineer and Planning Board Attorney for their opinions. In an email response on October 19, 2023, Mr. Yager indicated that the Landscaping Plan that was approved as part of the Incentive Zoning application, shows an extensive planting plan that

needs to be followed in the vegetative buffer area. The planting plan was part of the IZ benefits provided by the developer that I believe would need Town Board approval to change. In discussing this with Rober Wicks, Supervisro, he asked that the Planning Board make a recommendation prior to approaching the Town Board.

Considerable discussion ensued with the following resolution being the result:

RESOLUTION #15 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

Resolved, that at the request of the Town Board with regard to modifying the Incentive Zoning Negotiations for Whispering Oaks, Section IV, the Planning Board makes the following recommendations:

WHEREAS, the Town Board has requested that the Planning Board provide a recommendation regarding a request for relief from the approved Incentive Zoning Landscaping/screening condition as it pertains to Lot 25, 100 Harkins Lane in Whispering Oaks, Section IV, and

WHEREAS this condition was part of the Town Board's rational for granting the higher Incentive Zoning density for the development of Whispering Oaks, Section Iv, and

WHEREAS the granting of the requested relief from the Incentive Zoning condition would set a precedent for existing and future Incentive Zoning Developments..

NOW THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Planning Board hereby recommends that the Twon Board should not grant the relief from the Incentive Zoning Landscaping/Screening Condition.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

VI. ADJOURN

RESOLUTION #16 -- Motion by Kimball, Second by Darcangelo

RESOLVED, that the November 9, 2023 regular Planning Board meeting adjourn at 8:13 p.m.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Rice, Clerk  
Planning Board