

TOWN OF LYSANDER  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
8220 Loop Road  
Monday November 15, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.

The special meeting of the Lysander Planning Board was held Monday, November 15, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. at the Lysander Town Building, 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Corey, Chairman; Hugh Kimball; William Lester and Doug Beachel

MEMBERS ABSENT: Steve Darcangelo

OTHERS PRESENT: Al Yager, Town Engineer; Tim Frateschi, Planning Board Attorney; Dan Pollock; John Langey, Esq; Frank Fava, B & F Development; Steve Sehnert, Applied Earth Technologies; Dan Barnaba, Eldan Homes; Kevin Rode; David Haahr; Jared Lusk, Esq., Nixon Peabody LLP; Christian Hill, Napierala Consulting 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 October 14, 2021 regular Planning Board meeting will be tabled.

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. Controlled Site Use-Amendment Pollock, Dan/High Country Storage  
2079 Church Road

Christian Hill, Napierala Consulting, represented the applicant, stating that they were the Board a couple years ago with Phase I of the High County Self-storage located on Church Road and Route 48. Phase I is existing, everything is in the ground and we're now here for Phase II. Phase II is immediately adjacent to the north of Phase I. It's the same site use and almost the exact same size as Phase I. We are showing another in-door climate controlled storage building that will have an interior, hallways and also similar to what's existing there today...doors along the perimeter for outside use, drive-up, overhead doors, along the outside. The rest of the buildings around that larger climate controlled building in the center will all be your standard, typical self-storage buildings that are not climate controlled that have drive-up access with the overhead doors. The stormwater permit for the site is still in place and active with DEC. We have provided the Town with updated Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. The Town Engineer has looked at it and we'll coordinate with him to cover any comments that he has on the design. We are expanding the detention basin a little bit and also providing the water quality portion for Phase II, as was always planned, there was always going to be a second bio-retention to cover all of that additional impervious area that comes with the Phase II design. To the north of all of this storage buildings will be a gravel pad area for truck, trailer and RV storage. We were here a couple months ago for an amendment for an expansion to that; that is basically just being moved up to the north of all of these buildings, same use and almost same size as exists there today. We're just pushing it up to the north to make room for the self-storage buildings. Everything else is pretty standard. Mr. Yager has approached us already to discuss that we are right now showing pavement in that front yard setback on Route 48; so, Dan and I will have to discuss what approach we want to take there. We may end up adjusting the layout to show that pavement within the setback, but we're also going to discuss the possibility of going to the ZBA and asking for a variance for that. We're not sure at this point in time what we will do.

There is a letter on file dated November 15, 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 Phase II Site Plans dated November 1m 2021. The following comments will need to be addressed with a revised submission. The revised plan submission will need to be stamped and signed by a licensed engineer.

## **Site Plans**

### **Overall Layout Plan C-4**

1. The proposed security fence and interior site roadway will need to be located outside of the 140' setback.
2. There are very limited now storage areas available as shown. The owner should consider relocating the perimeter fence back way from the edge of pavement an additional 10' to 15' to allow for snow storage on the west side of the site without damaging the fence.

### **Grading & Erosion Control Plan C-6**

3. Additional pond dewatering specifications will need to be provided for the proposed stormwater detention basin expansion.
4. A concrete washout location will need to be added to the plan.

### **SWPPP**

5. A SWPPP change form will need to be added to appendix E that reflects the proposed site changes included in Phase II of the project.

With regard to the pavement and fence being within the 140' setback, as you can see they were allowed to do that on the Church Road side, because there is a provision in the Code that says it can be as close as adjoining lots and because CNY Land Surveying has parking shown (indicating on plan); we allowed them to put their parking and fence at the same distance off of the centerline of Church Road because that is what's allowed by Code. In this instance there is a vacant lot between this lot and the next house, so that provision doesn't really apply per our Code, so they have to meet the 140' setback on the Route 48 side of the site. It is certainly a change they can overcome, I know the ZBA has granted variances like this in the past, so that may be something they choose to do and go through the variance process. We won't see them back here until they get through that.

John Corey, Chairman, stated that basically for tonight's purposes we can ask any questions that we might have, but we aren't able to take any action.

Mr. Yager concurred stating that one other option would be having Dan combine his vacant lot that is adjacent to this parcel. That would allow the same exception as was done on Church Road and stay in line with the structure on the adjacent parcel

There being nothing further, the applicant and his representative will let the Board know how they want to proceed.

Mr. Hill thanked the Board for their time.

## **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

### **1. Major Subdivision**

Eldan Homes  
River Grove, Phase II

Dan Barnaba, Eldan Homes, stated that he made an appearance last month for an amendment to a Preliminary Plan approval for River Grove. The Board requested that we correct some of lot count on the map so that we're showing a total of forty-four (44) lots and discuss the phasing of the project. Everything in yellow is already developed (indicating on the plan) and those are numbered 1 through 22; but Lot No. 12 was given up, it was combined with Lots 11 and 13, so there's essentially twenty-one (21) lots in the southern section of the project. We are showing a lay-out of twenty-three (23) more lots The Board also requested that we discuss how those lots will be phased during the construction. Steve Sehnert, Applied Earth Technologies, identified the phasing on the plan:

Phase IIA Lots 23 & 39

Phase IIB Lots 32 – 38 and 40 & 41

Phase IIC Lots 24 – 31 and 42 – 45

Mr. Barnaba previously represented to the Board that they could make the connection to Glacier Ridge during the first section of the development. That represents all of these lots but because the road section is already in and these two lots can be serviced by the existing road (Tulip Tree Path), these would Phase IIA. Phase IIB would add all of the lots along the existing road section and the balance would be developed (unclear). The lot count is consistent with what was submitted to the State when the Offering Plan was reviewed and approved for forty-four (44) home sites if the project built-out. I mentioned that it's not uncommon for us to combine or re-

layout lots if we had buyers that want more than one home site. So, it's probably not out of the question that we'll end up with forty-four, but with an approval tonight this would assure that we wouldn't have more than forty-four (44).

John Corey, Chairman, questioned when the connection to Glacier Ridge would be made.

Mr. Barnaba stated that during the first phase of that site we're going to put this road in, but we'll have the opportunity to build on two building lots before any infrastructure is put in; but at the time we're extending the sewer line, bringing water connections in and extending the road, this connection will be made. These houses will all be serviced by essentially the new entrance. It will be less of an intrusion on the rest.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that it will be built to construction entrance standards basically...

Mr. Barnaba stated that they can sign it that way, as a matter of fact we can put signs at both signs at both entrances. I mean it's hard to control what drivers do, but...we can try.

Mr. Barnaba continued stating that we'll be making a marketing effort at that point so we'll have signs up.

Tim Frateschi, Planning Board Attorney, questioned how many lots were approved in the preliminary plat in 2013, nineteen?

Mr. Barnaba stated that he wasn't around at that time. It wasn't clear to me goes back quite a way, 2007 maybe. I believe at time or another the entire project was approved.

Karen Rice, Clerk, stated conceptually, not the Preliminary Plat for all forty-four (44) lots, it was a sketch plan. Nineteen (19) lots were approved in 2013.

Mr. Barnaba stated that there seems to be an inconsistency in the approval because I know the Contract Drawings for the entire site was approved. It's hard to imagine that the Contract Drawings were invested in and approved before Site Plan action. Most of the time a developer would not invest that.

Mr. Frateschi stated that our records show that there was an approval in 2013 for nineteen (19) approved lots. So, you want to go from nineteen (19) to twenty-three (23).

Mr. Barnaba stated that he wants to go from forty-four to forty-four. I want to keep the number of lots that was intended to the community to be the same.

Mr. Frateschi stated that he understands that...you've got a preliminary subdivision approval for nineteen (19) lots; what was approved in Phase I is not before this Board. I don't really know what happened for Phase I, I'm just trying to square our records with what we're being asked for because it's really going to be the Board's decision in terms of if we're going to go from nineteen approved lots to twenty-three approved lots....is that a material enough change that you want to have a Public Hearing on it. That's really the question.

Mr. Barnaba stated that if it's looked at on in individual section, an addition of four lots or 20% might be significant, but if it's looked on as what was intended as the whole it wouldn't be....

Mr. Frateschi stated that those are not decisions for me to make or you to make, it's a decision of the Board.

Mr. Barnaba stated that he's just trying to position it in a less threatening manner so that somebody wouldn't necessarily challenge it because they think it's material when the neighbors, the Radisson Community Association and the State of New York had forty-four lots in mind.

Mr. Frateschi stated that he doesn't know what was in the Offering Plan, that's not really the concern of this Planning Board. I don't know what's in the Covenants, it's not really a concern of this Planning Board. It's simply, does this lot configuration of twenty-three lots make sense and is it a material difference from the already approved Phase II, not in the sense of huge, is it significant enough to have another Public Hearing. That's really the only issue as far as I can see it. Jump in if you don't agree.

Doug Beachel stated that since the road configuration hasn't changed, it's ultimately just lot lines, so in my mind it's not a material change.

Mr. Yager stated that the attorney explained it perfectly, that's the only question, do we want to have a Public Hearing...

Mr. Frateschi asked if we want to determine that this is not a material change to this subdivision plan because it's only three (3) additional lots. The road configuration is the same as it was before, and the overall density is not going to be affected by this. Those would be the reasons not to hold a second Public Hearing, but that is a determination for the Board to make.

Mr. Corey stated that we have the same configuration as previously approved on the original Phase I, Phase II. We have the same proposed number of total lots. I really don't see this rising to the level of a material change.

With that being said, Mr. Yager stated that the other thing that should be noted is that this is a subdivision with an HOA inside of and HOA and private roads. Additional units spread the long term maintenance costs of those private roads over additional homeowners, so potentially it will be a lower maintenance cost per unit by allowing additional units to be developed above the nineteen that were previously approved.

Mr. Corey stated that the way he's looking at it is, now we're going to have the original forty-four that was intended, so we're actually not adding anything, other than what was approved; but at least, because they took lots out in Phase I by combining and selling, now we can get to that better economic situation from an HOA for the private roads. From my experience and Dan was making that point earlier is there's a good chance we'll have less than twenty-three lots when we're done because somebody is going to buy two, or whatever...they won't have more, but they can have less. At least three members of the Board don't see this a material level for a Public Hearing.

Mr. Kimball concurred.

There is a letter on file prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, dated November 15, 2021 that will be made part of the public record, in part:

I have completed my review of the Amended River Grove Phase II Preliminary Plat and lot phasing plan prepared by Applied Earth Technologies with a final revision date of November 11, 2021. The map appears to be in conformance to all applicable Town and State specifications. The project is currently covered under an active SPDES permit and SWPPP and the construction drawings for the overall development have been approved by the Town Board. Per the Lysander Town Code all required infrastructure improvements will need to be completed prior to the chairman signing the final plat for the subdivision.

#### FINDINGS:

A determination by the Board has already been made that it's not a significant change from the Preliminary Plat that was approved in 2013, because the overall number of lots in this subdivision are not going to be changed from forty-four (44) lots.

The road configuration is exactly the same and because these are private roads there will be no impact on the Town's infrastructure because of the added housing.

The SEQR that was completed in 2013 and has not been changed as there has been no increase in the environmental significance for four (4) additional lots.

Due to the conditions expressed no Public Hearing will be required.

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

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing having been previously held and there being no findings or grounds for decision contrary to the laws and regulations of the Town of Lysander, County of Onondaga or State of New York, an Amended Preliminary Plat approval, amending the nineteen (19) lot subdivision to a twenty-three (23) lot subdivision application by Eldan Homes, for property located at River Grove Phase II, Baldwinsville, New York, Part of Farm Lot 61 and Tax Map No. 081.2-01-01.1, as shown on a map dated October 1, 2021, revised November 11, 2021, prepared by Stephen Sehnert, Licensed Land Surveyor, is hereby approved.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Greg Sgromo, Dunn & Sgromo, represented the applicant, stating that we appreciate the Board's time tonight. We have some additional information that we wanted to get the Board's opinion on to make sure we're on the right track. Site Plan Features:

- Fire Truck Access: We did get the fire truck model, so we're able to put that in the site and it does get around very well. It can get down each of these lanes between the buildings. Basically, each building has three sides that it accessible by fire trucks/apparatus. It will meet all fire code requirements with review and approval by the Belgium Cold Springs Fire Department.
- Fire Hydrant: Basically, they can have them placed anywhere they want. We are going to have public waterlines brought to the site, so where the Fire Department decides they want hydrants. There should not be any issues there.
- Wetland Report: The report has been completed and submitted to the Army Corp of Engineers, they are the ones that have jurisdiction over the wetlands that are on the site. This large wetland (indicating on plan) did get slightly larger that reduced the size of the development by one building, so we were able to move some stuff around. The clubhouse and maintenance buildings were shifted, the apartment buildings stayed the same. There is a smaller wetland shown, that is not going to be taken by the Army Corp of Engineers since it's non-jurisdictional. It is not connected and is too small. We have been trying to get a letter from them; all we've received is verbal. We realize we can't move forward with SEQR until that is done and we totally understand that.
- Stormwater: Stormwater mitigation plan has been shown, ponds, bio-retention areas and aesthetic features to make them pleasing

There was some discussion as to how deep the ponds would be with Mr. Sgromo stating that they're going to be at least eight (8) feet deep with an aquatic bench, as required, DEC designed, 3 on 1 maximum. If we can avoid safety benches by making it a little flatter we will.

Mr. Sgromo stated that a comment was made at the last meeting with regard to how is this project going to compare with the project that's a cross Route 31. In many ways it is different. We cater to different groups. The apartments across the street have a lot more children involved. We're not going to have as many, just by the way it's laid out. Although it is three-stories, as opposed to two-story, that's where the numbers come in making it a little more dense on this site, but I feel the overall site is probably about the same density wise. The buildings are different, there are garages internal to the building, landscaping. It's a dramatically different type of apartment complex.

Hugh Kimball questioned the intended market.

Mr. Sgromo stated that it will be very similar to what's at Center Pointe. Frank Fava, Developer, can tell you a little bit more about what they're getting there for tenants, tenant mixes...but they're mainly one and two-bedroom apartment. We've reduced the number of three-bedroom apartments.

- Cross Sections: Last year we provided you with some cross sections of the development and what we thought were some key areas, primarily you'll see through the site between the two Oak Brooks (plans provided for the Board). This gives you a nice perspective as far as the elevation grade difference is in the different neighborhoods and that sort of thing...what you're visually seeing.
- Visualization/View Shed: Aerial photos provided of what you'll see from different perspectives. No trees along Route 31 will be unnecessarily removed. You're not going to see much on Route 31, as the photos are from the perspective of driving by on Route 31. We will be taking out scrub trees and putting in 6' to 8' trees that will put them at about a ten year growth cycle. The planting can be worked out; we can go out in the field and work out what makes sense, however, we're not going to be able to hide the entire project.

Mr. Sgromo stated that the key things we have got outstanding at this point is the Wetland Delineation sign-off from Army Corp; which we should have any day now. Finalize the SWPPP, which should be ready by the end of the week and the Fire Department. Those are things left, unless the Board has something else.

John Corey, Chairman, stated that at this point there is nothing to add. You already understand the situation we're in with SEQR. As soon as you can provide us with the outstanding materials

we'll be in a position to move forward with the SEQR determination and then schedule the Public Hearing, but until then we're here.

John Langey, Esq., suggested the Project Engineer mention the letter received from the Radisson Community Association two weeks ago.

Mr. Corey stated that we are aware of that and it will be put on the record when we have the Public Hearing.

Mr. Langey stated that he knew they were, but it's mentioned for the record. Thank you. .

## V. OTHER BUSINESS

1. SEQR Recommendation to Town Board: Tarpon Towers/Abbott, Windsor  
7780 Hicks Road

John Corey, Chairman, stated that the Town Board is requesting a SEQR recommendation from the Planning Board with regard to Tarpon Towers for the location of a cellular communication tower on property located at 7780 Hicks Road.

Jared Lusk, Esq, Nixon-Peabody, represented the applicant, stating that it's a 120' project, with a seven (7) foot fence, six (6) of it regular with a foot of barbed wire to keep people out, with radio equipment cabinets at the base of the tower on a concrete slab. I hope everyone has had the opportunity to review the application; I hope you have as there's a lot of information. I'm going to summarize it in three minutes or less. There are two existing towers serving the east side of Lysander, neither of which are in the Town of Lysander. One of them is in the Town of VanBuren and the other is in the Town of Clay. Both of those towers are over volume in terms of traffic. There's a tremendous amount of traffic flowing through those two projects. If you were to look at Tab E of the application there's a reason, it shows the existing coverage area and they're just over-volume. This tower is proposed to be parked between these two towers with the plan that it'll grab the traffic from the area outlined in green (indicating on plan). In essence it will directly relieve traffic on the other two towers, The traffic covered by two will now be covered by three. We're just trying to provide some new coverage to relieve some of the capacity problems. It requires a Special Use Permit from the Town Board. We are trying desperately to complete the balloon in accordance with your notice requirements, which has to be noticed at least a week in advance, but in CNY and Upstate New York you can't predict weather that far in advance. It seems like every time we go to advertise the weather doesn't work.

Tim Frateschi, Planning Board Attorney, stated that or responsibility is to look at Part 2 of the Full EAF to see whether any of the impacts are going to raise any red flags with this Board.

The applicant prepared Part 1 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form and the Planning Board reviewed Part 2: Identification of Potential Project Impacts:

**IMPACT ON LAND:** Proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of, the land surface of the proposed site. No, it's a monopole structure constructed on a slap.

**IMPACT ON A GEOLOGICAL FEATURES:** 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:** The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies (e.g., streams, rivers, ponds or lakes). No

**IMPACT ON GROUNDWATER:** The 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:** The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding. No

**IMPACTS ON AIR:** The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source. No

**IMPACTS ON PLANTS AND ANIMALS:** The proposed action may result in a loss of flora or fauna. No, small disturbance of land, less than an acre.

**IMPACT ON AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES:** The proposed action may impact agricultural resources. No, this area has been farmed, but the disturbance is only 282' x 282', minimal, on the edge of the field. Plenty of agricultural land remaining.

**IMPACT ON AESTHETIC RESOURCES:** 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 scenic or aesthetic resource. No, there are towers in the vicinity, except for visual impacts it might have, however the applicant is proposing to do a balloon flight to get a Visual Impact Study to the Town Board. Any approval should be contingent on the visual impacts.

**IMPACT ON HISTORIC AND AGRICHOLOGICAL RESOURCES:** the proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource. An archaeological study has been done, waiting on the SHPO Determination Letter of Concurrence. Any approval should be contingent on SHPO's recommendation.

**IMPACT ON OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION:** 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:** the proposed action may be located within or adjacent to a critical environmental area (CEA). No, we don't have CEA's designated in the Town of Lysander.

**IMPACT ON TRANSPORTATION:** the proposed action may result in a change to existing transportation systems. No

**IMPACT ON ENERGY;** The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy. No

**IMPACT ON NOISE, ODOR AND LIGHT:** The proposed action may result in an increase in noise, odors, or outdoor lighting. No, the tower is 120'. A beacon is not required unless a tower is over 200' or anything that is in a flight pattern less than 200'. The proposed tower is not in a flight pattern.

**IMPACT ON HUMAN HEALTH:** the proposed action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants. No, this project is going to be regulated by the Federal Communications Commission.

**CONSISTENCY WITH COMMUNITY PLANS:** The proposed action is non consistent with adopted land use plans. No, the property is properly zoned for this use.

**CONSISTENCY WITH COMMUNITY CHARACTER:** The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character. No, because of the size and scope of this project.

Mr. Frateschi stated that based on our review, the only two things we've identified that could have potential impacts are impacts on visual and aesthetics and SHPO.

**RESOLUTION #2** -- Motion by Corey, Second by Beachel

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, on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was called to order by John Corey, as Chairman, and the following were present, namely: Hugh Kimball, Member, William Lester, member, Doug Beachel, member. Steve Darcangelo, Member, was absent. The Planning Board has reviewed Part 2 of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (Full EAF) for Tarpon Towers II, LLC for a Wireless Communication Facility located at 7780 Hicks Road, Baldwinsville, New York and don't find any significant environmental impacts contingent on the applicant supplying the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Determination Letter with regard to Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources and a Visual Assessment with regard to impact on Aesthetic Resources.

The following resolution was moved, seconded and adopted:

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board, at the request of the Town Board, make a recommendation to the Town Board on the Full Environmental Assessment Form for Tarpon Towers II, LLC and that it be considered a Type I Action with a Negative Declaration conditioned upon a SHPO Determination letter and a Visual Assessment being submitted.

Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Lusk thanked the Board for their time.

2. Major Subdivision—Waive Hearing/Sign Plat: Crimson Ridge  
Sabin Road

Dan Barnaba, Eldan Homes, stated that what is before the Board this evening is a section of the Crimson Ridge Subdivision, Section 5, Sabin Road. Although the parcel is not directly contiguous to Radisson, it's part of Radisson. Originally the plan was approved when Crimson Ridge, Section 5 was approved (Lots 12 & 13 at the time). Over a period of time we had a hard time finding buyers that would live on Sabin Road on those home sites. We came back before the Board a year ago going from two lots to four lots thinking lot prices would be lower and we could attract a different type of buyer and home. That amended plan, although approved, was never filed. They required a sewer line improvement, we didn't make the sewer line improvement and we couldn't get the approval of the County to file the map until we did that. In the meantime, we have found buyers. One of the first buyer we found wanted a larger home site on the norther section, so we came up with the three (3) lot plan. The three (3) lot plan through the use of a sewer line easement will go from an existing manhole all the way to Sabin Road, which allows all three lots to be serviced by the sewer that is already in place. We are asking the Board to abandon the four (4) lot plan that was originally approved and approved this three (3) lot plan. If approved, we will request the Chairman's signature and work with the County for filing the map.

There is a letter on file dated November 15, 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 resubdivision of Lot Nos. 12 & 13, previously included in the Section 5 of the Crimson Ridge project prepared by Ianuzi-Romans Land Surveying, P.C., dated August 24, 2021 the proposed resubdivision of Lots 12 & 13 does not exceed the overall density shown in the Crimson Ridge preliminary plat approval. At this time, I would not be opposed to the Planning Board granting final plat approval to resubdivision of Lots No. 12 & 13, previously included in the Section 5 of the Crimson Ridge project.

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

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing having been held on the application of Eldan Homes for a resubdivision of property located at Crimson Ridge, Section 5, Sabin Road, Baldwinsville, New York, Part of Farm Lot No. 82 and Tax Map No. 075.1-01-18, for a development of three (3) lots from a parcel of approximately 33,000 square feet; as shown on a map dated August 24, 2020 and revised November 4, 2021, prepared by Ianuzi-Romans, Licensed Land Surveyor, is hereby approved because the number of lots are going from four (4) lots to three (3) lots that were approved for a Preliminary Subdivision. As a result, the Final Subdivision will be less impactful, so previous SEQRA determination is not changed and no Public Hearing for Final Plat is necessary; with the following condition:

- 1) Conditioned upon all applicable fees, if any, being paid.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Barnaba thanked the Board for their time.

3. Major Subdivision—Waive Hearing/Sign Plat Timber Banks, Section 3, Phase 4  
Lots 416 – 421 Forest Ridge

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that we made a discovery this afternoon that this is the same plat, with no changes, from what the Planning Board approved in July. The approval was contingent upon the Town Board accepting dedication of the roads and utilities, which the Town Board did at their second meeting in October. At this point in time, no further action is required by the Planning Board, because it's the exact same map that was submitted in July and approved.

Plans are stamped and ready for signatures.

4. Major Subdivision—Waive Hearing/Sign Plat      Collington Pointe East/Copper River  
Lots 63, 64, 82 & 89 Chillingham

James Trasher, CHA Associates, represented the applicant, stating that this is our standard final four lots of Phase I, Collington Pointe East/Copper River.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that his only contingency on approval would be that Lots 82 And 89 need to have driveways off of Chillingham Way so they're not coming out on to a road that has not been constructed and dedicated to the Town.

Mr. Trasher concurred, unless Stoney Pond Way is constructed, the lots can't be closed on unless the driveways are on Chillingham or Stoney Pond Way.

Mr. Yager concurred.

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

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board authorizes the Chairperson to review the Final Plat for the Collington Pointe/Copper River Subdivision application for property located at Phase 1, Section 3, Lots 63, 64, 82 & 89, Chillingham Way, Baldwinsville, New York, Part of Tax Map No. 073.1-01-41.1 and finding that all modifications and conditions have been met; the Board authorizes the Chairperson to waive the Final Plat Public Hearing and sign the Final Plat; with the following condition:

- 1) Driveways for Lots 82 and 89 must come out onto a road that the Town has accepted dedication of.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

VI. ADJOURN

RESOLUTION #5 -- Motion by Beachel, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that the Monday, November 15, 2021 Planning Board meeting adjourn at 8:14 p.m.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Rice, Clerk